DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 329 95 EA 007 245

AUTHOR	Pascal, Anthony H.; And Others
TITLE	Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. 3: The Process of Change. Appendix D: Innovations in Career Education.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	R-1589/3-HEW(APP.D)
PUB DATE	Apr 75
NOTE	94p.; Related documents are ED 099 957, EA 007 240-247
AVAILABLE FROM	Rand Corp., 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, California 90406 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Adoption (Ideas); *Career Education; Case Studies (Education); *Change Agents; Change Strategies; Diffusion; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; State Departments of Education; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Vocational Education Act

ABSTRACT

This appendix deals with career education projects funded under the Vocational Education Act, 1968 Amendments, Part D. Section 1 of the appendix describes the origins and the planning and management strategies that the United States Office of Education adopted for this program. Section 2 describes the role of state education agencies. Section 3 presents syntheses of the fieldwork case studies, which describe the similarities and differences found in the planning, implementation, and adaptation of each of the projects covered. It also attempts to generalize from the limited evidence. Section 4 presents the individual case studies for these career education projects. (Author)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED108329

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FEDERAL PROGRAMS SUPPORTING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, VOL. III: THE PROCESS OF CHANGE

Appendix D. Innovations in Career Education

PREPARED FOR THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

ANTHONY H. PASCAL
RICHARD F. ELMORE
TODD I. ENDO
LAWRENCE McCLUSKEY

R-1589/3-HEW (APP. D)
APRIL 1975

$5.-

Rand
SANTA MONICA, CA. 90406

EA 007 245

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract HEW-OS-73-216 with the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Views or conclusions contained in this study should not be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

PREFACE

Rand is conducting, under the sponsorship of the U.S Office of Education, a several-year study of federally funded programs designed to introduce and spread innovative practices in public schools. These change agent programs normally offer temporary federal funding to school districts as "seed money." If an innovation is successful, it is assumed that the district will continue and disseminate part or all of the project using other sources of funds. The Rand study examines four such federal change agent programs--Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title III, Innovative Projects; Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title VII, Bilingual Projects; Vocational Education Act, 1968 Amendments, Part D, Exemplary Programs; and the Right-To-Read Program. The study identifies what tends to promote various kinds of changes in the schools and what doesn't; in particular, the Rand study will identify for federal, state, and local policymakers the nature, permanence, and extent of dissemination of innovations that are associated with the various federal programs and with various federal, state, and local practices.

A series of five reports describes the first-year results of the Rand study (July 1973 to July 1974):

Volume I (R-1589/1-HEW, A Model of Educational Change) provides a theoretical perspective for the Rand study by analyzing the current state of knowledge of planned change in education and by proposing a conceptual model of factors affecting change processes within school districts.*

Volume II (R-1589/2-HEW, Factors Affecting Change Agent Projects) contains the analysis of survey data collected by a national sample of 293 projects in 18 states during November and December 1973.

Volume III (R-1589/3-HEW, The Process of Change) summarizes the findings and policy implications resulting from 29 case studies of change agent projects conducted by Rand staff members and consultants in 25 school districts during April and May 1974. The case study sites, chosen from the original sample of 293 projects initially surveyed, represent a variety of project objectives and local district conditions. This report also describes the role of the state education agencies in selecting, managing, and disseminating change agent projects.

---

*Because of Rand's interest in advancing knowledge of organizational behavior in educational institutions, the research underlying this report was supported in part by an allocation of Rand corporate research funds.

Volume IV (R-1589/4-HEW, The Findings in Review) summarizes the findings of Vols. I, II, and III, and also synthesizes extensive data collected by Rand on federal-level program strategy and management for each of the change agent projects. Volume IV also includes a discussion of alternative federal strategies for promoting innovation.

Volume V (R-1589/5-HEW, Executive Summary) presents the study's methods and results for a general audience.

Subsequent research will collect additional data on Titles III and VII of ESEA, with particular focus on projects whose federal funding has expired.

This report is one of four appendixes to Vol. III. Each appendix deals with a different federal change program and brings together our first-year observations and findings at federal, state, and local levels. Appendix A deals with Title III, App. B with reading programs, App. C with bilingual education, and App. D with career education.

This appendix deals with career education projects funded under VEA, 1968 Amendments, Part D. Section I describes the origins and the planning and management strategies that USOE adopted for this program. Section II describes the role of state education agencies. Section III presents syntheses of our fieldwork case studies, which describe the similarities and differences we found in the planning, implementation, and adaptation of each of the projects covered. It also attempts to generalize from the limited evidence. Section IV presents the individual case studies for these career education projects. In all cases, the names of states, school district projects, and people are fictitious. Each district that participated did so under a promise of anonymity; our respondents' frankness and cooperativeness testify to the merits of this guarantee in producing a fair picture of how these projects developed, with their various strengths and weaknesses.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

Section

I. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, PART D, EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS. . . I-1
  General Overview I-1
  Program Budget and Number of Projects I-1
  Program Strategy I-2

II. STATE EDUCATION AGENCY PARTICIPATION II-1
  Funding II-1
  Generation and Selection of Projects II-2
  Project Management and Dissemination of Results II-3

III. SYNTHESIS OF CASE STUDIES III-1
  Initiation III-3
  Implementation III-7
  Maintenance and Adaptation III-9
  Continuation and Dissemination III-11
  Conclusions III-12

IV. CASE STUDIES IV-1
  Tip County IV-3
  Coaltown IV-12
  Midville IV-20
  Eastplace IV-30
  Bikson County IV-40
  Lakewood IV-49
  Northshore IV-60

I. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, PART D, EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS

GENERAL OVERVIEW

This section gives a brief overview of the Vocational Education, Part D program to serve as a background for understanding the case studies of individual projects contained in Sec. III.

The Vocational Education, Part D program was enacted in 1968 as part of the comprehensive amendments to the 1963 Vocational Education Act. The general motivation to create the Part D program was to stimulate new ways of thinking about vocational education among state and local education agencies through the demonstration of exemplary programs in each of the states. Reflecting a belief that state agencies were not the sole mechanism for facilitating significant innovations, Congress, for the first time in the history of vocational education, gave the Office of Education (OE) the authority to fund local projects directly through the Part D (exemplary), Part C (research), and Part I (curriculum development) programs.

PROGRAM BUDGET AND NUMBER OF PROJECTS

Table 1 shows that the Part D program, since its inception, has been funded at a stable level far below its authorization. The legislation requires that the Commissioner of Education allocate $200,000 to each state. In addition, he is required to allocate the remainder of the appropriation to the states in proportion to the population in each state between the ages of 15 and 19. The Commissioner and each SEA then divide the sum allocated to each state in half and administer their own halves independently.

In FY 1970, the Part D program funded its first round of projects. The federally administered Part D program (for the most part) funded one project in each state for a legislatively stipulated maximum of three years with budgets generally between $100,000 and $150,000 per year. The federal contribution to the budgets remained more or less constant in each of the three years, and grantees were not required to provide any matching funds. However, they were required to state in their proposals how they expected to finance the projects after the expiration of the federal grant. Since grants were not restricted by legislation to SEAs or LEAs, the program office gave a few grants to nonprofit private

Table 1

AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS FOR PART D PROGRAM

($ million)

FY	Authorization	President's Request	Appropriations
1969	$ 15		$ 0
1970	57	$ 13	13
1971	75	13	16
1972	75	0	16
1973	75	16	16
1974	75	16	16
1975	75	0	16

SOURCE: Annual Evaluation Report on Education Programs: FY 1973, U.S. DHEW, OE, Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation (internal report).

organizations and to universities in addition to grants to LEAs and SEAs. Because the level of funding has remained stable, the program initiated few other new projects until the expiration of the first-round projects in FY 1973.

PROGRAM STRATEGY

The authorizing legislation expressed the hope that the Part D program would help "to stimulate, through federal financial support, new ways to create a bridge between school and earning a living for young people" and "to promote cooperation between public education and manpower agencies." To accomplish this, the Part D program was authorized to fund the planning, development, establishment, operation, and evaluation of "exemplary programs or projects," which could be designed to "familiarize elementary and secondary school students" with a broad range of careers, provide work experiences, provide "intensive occupational guidance and counseling" and "initial job placement," improve vocational education curricula, arrange personnel exchanges among a variety of institutions, provide part-time education for workers, and "motivate and provide preprofessional preparation for potential teachers for vocational education."

Congress left it to OE to specify what such exemplary programs would contain. In its grants announcement and program policy paper, the Part D program office espoused a "career development" approach to education that would link vocational education more closely to general education. Specifically, it required applicants to provide in one operational setting the following four elements:

1. Broad occupational orientation at the elementary and secondary school levels to increase student awareness of the range of occupational options open to them.*
2. Work experience, cooperative education, and similar programs, making possible a wide variety of offerings in many occupational areas.
3. Specific training in job-entry skills for students not previously enrolled in vocational programs just before they leave the school. (Some of these training programs might be short yet intensive.)
4. Intensive occupational guidance and counseling during the last years of school and for initial placement of all students at the completion of their schooling. (Placement should be accomplished in cooperation with appropriate employment services, manpower agencies, etc.)

The Part D staff believed that these initial goals were quite similar to what later was embodied in the concept of career education.

The program office intended that the federally managed projects would provide examples to stimulate new thinking about vocational education among state and local educators, and would stimulate the SEAs to implement the career development ideas using their funds and staff. Toward this goal of redirecting the SEAs' approaches to vocational education, the federal program staff also sought to work closely and cooperatively with the SEA staffs.

Projects were generated in the Part D program by sending a program announcement to the executive officers of the state boards for vocational education and the state directors of vocational education. They, in turn, publicized the program and solicited proposals from local educational groups. Upon request, the federal program office sent a prospective applicant a brief practical manual on how to prepare a proposal, the program regulations, a booklet on exemplary vocational education programs, and a brief bibliography of previous research put out by the

---

*This is the key element; it extended career development education down into the elementary schools and expanded the concept to include career explorations as well as specific career training.

Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). The manual and regulations were purposely vague regarding requirements for the substance of the projects in order to allow local groups to formulate their own ideas within the parameters set by the policy paper. No planning grants were given, and applicants were required to develop complete 36-month operating plans as part of their proposals.

Applicants simultaneously sent proposals to OE and to the state board of education. The states had 60 days to reject any proposal sent to them. From the remaining proposals, the federal program office staff and 15 outside reviewers selected the grantees in each state. One meeting of all reviewers was convened to come to some agreement on the use of the rating sheet and the selection criteria. Thereafter, each proposal was read by at least two outside reviewers and one staff person, and discussions were conducted by mail and by telephone until final selections were made. Because of a legislative provision allowing funds to be carried over from one fiscal year to the next, the program office did not have a deadline to meet for final selections. The staff members felt that this flexibility was vital in the first selection process because it enabled them to return unacceptable proposals for revisions and, in some cases, replacement. The most frequent reasons for returning proposals were failure to include all components in one operational setting and lack of specificity concerning educational practices to be tried. The effect of this feedback was a more standardized set of proposals across districts. As a result, 25 of the 55 first-round projects were selected in FY 1970. Some were not funded until well into the next fiscal year.

One major deviation from this selection process was the designation by DHEW Secretary Finch of 20 projects for Model Cities programs in specified cities. In these 20 cases, the Model Cities program planners essentially were given a grant and asked to write an operational plan for it. The program office staff considers this lack of competition detrimental to success because in many cases the Model Cities program planners were not so committed to the purposes of career education as they were to other social objectives.

The goals and operations of the Part D program at the state level are described in Sec. II.

II. STATE EDUCATION AGENCY PARTICIPATION[*]

FUNDING

Vocational Education, Part D monies fund projects that demonstrate activities in career education in existing school settings. Funds are divided among the states according to a formula partially based on population. Within each state's allotment, the SEA administers half of the funds; OE administers the other half.

For the federally administered funds, OE invites school districts to submit proposals, and in the majority of cases the best proposal from each state and territory is funded. OE sends prospective applicants a brief manual on how to write a proposal and a booklet describing some Part D projects, but does not give any systematic assistance in the development of proposals. The input of the states in project generation and selection varies.

Our survey indicates that the degree to which the SEA does give assistance is directly related to how much it regards the project as its own. In some instances, the OE role in project selection is pro forma: Proposals are sent to the SEA, which has the option of selecting only the best one to forward to Washington. These states, in effect, choose the federal project by forwarding what is in their opinion the best proposal. On the other hand, two of the twelve states interviewed stated they had no knowledge about the federal project because of the federal policy of direct award to the LEA. They expressed displeasure with this system.

For the state portion of Vocational Education, Part D funds, the SEA selects and manages projects, and contact with the federal office is minimal. It may use its money to supplement the federal project, to run one large state project, or to fund many small state projects.

Since OE does not specify any particular state management strategy, wide variations occur among the SEAs in administering Part D funds. Two basic models of state management strategies can be distinguished; the difference is between states that are committed to the concept of career education and those that are not.

1. Commitment to career education. The staff is actively involved in soliciting new projects, from assuring that each LEA submits a proposal to prescribing which LEAs will have projects. The SEA staff may assist

---

[*] Based on telephone interviews with program officers in eighteen states and personal interviews in nine.

with, and participate in, writing the proposal. Only one SEA follows a formal selection procedure. Having been closely involved in project development, the staff knows which projects it will fund. These projects receive much SEA attention--both on-site presence and technical assistance.

2. Lack of commitment to career education. LEAs are notified of the availability of funds for career education projects. The LEA initiates the request for funds. Project selection proceeds informally, with the final decision resting with the staff. Very little technical assistance or on-site counseling is provided.

The subcategories under the Vocational Education Act are not always mutually exclusive. For example, a research and development activity dealing with the area of Homemaking could be funded either under Part C (R&D) or Part F (Consumer and Homemaking). Since demands on Part F funds are generally not nearly as heavy as those on Part C funds, R&D activities in Consumer-Homemaking areas are generally funded under Part F, because SEA officials strive to make the most efficient use of funds available to them. Part D funds are particularly susceptible to manipulation into areas that should be covered by other parts of the funding Act. For this reason, it is often difficult to assess the impact of Part D funds alone. These funds are sometimes simply combined with Part C monies in the interest of efficient SEA operations.

GENERATION AND SELECTION OF PROJECTS

Within the area of proposal generation and project selection, practices vary greatly between states. Some solicit proposals from every LEA, using pressure from the chief state school officer or traveling workshops to increase the rate of submittals. One large state received 1500 proposals in a single fiscal year.

In another state, the SEA staff tightly controls the selection process, encouraging proposals from only a few LEAs with which it has had lengthy negotiations. This state received only three proposals during the last year, all of which were funded.

In states where a number of proposals are received, different techniques are used to select those that will be funded. In one, the staff selects projects that "they feel will be the best" without any formal attempt at competitive ranking. In another, a unit outside of the regular vocational education staff ranks each of the proposals, using a standard rating form. The vocational education staff then funds the projects in the order of ranking.

In one state, the SEA staff exercises the initiative in getting projects started. Those LEAs that want Part D funds notify the SEA of their interest. The SEA staff then presents the LEAs it selects with the particular projects it wants developed.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS

The intensity of project management activities also varies considerably across states, apparently as a direct result of the interest that the SEA takes in any given project. In states where only a few projects of particular interest to the state are actually funded, project monitoring is likely to be intense. In states funding a large number of projects, monitoring can only be token, involving visits only once or twice a year.

The dissemination strategy of a state also seems to vary with its funding strategy. States that fund only a few carefully developed projects are likely to be interested in developing high-quality curriculum packages or exemplary project models, which can be utilized in other LEAs. On the other hand, states that attempt to fund many projects, with the objective of getting as many of their LEAs to participate as possible, devote less attention to developing exemplary packages, and spend most of their effort on simply promoting the career education cause.

In one SEA, the problem of obtaining a curriculum package of educational materials became a paramount issue. A thorough review of the literature revealed that there were none available. The SEA, which has a substantial commitment to vocational education, set about to develop one, using federal funds in the process. The staff managed to come up with a multimedia career education package for grades K-8, but since it did not have the facilities to produce large quantities of audio-filmic materials, it was unable to produce and distribute the package to the various LEAs. The SEA, which operates literally under the eyes of the state legislature, went to the state for assistance. The legislature obligingly passed a statute to the effect that all SEA-developed materials be disseminated as quickly as possible and in the most efficient way. The SEA was thus able to take bids on its vocational education curriculum package from a number of publishers and to sell production rights to the highest bidder. As a result, a private publishing concern currently produces materials developed with SEA dollars (both state and federal) and sells these materials commercially. The state receives a royalty on sales, which is placed in a fund from which any income derived is used to promote curriculum materials within the state.

III. SYNTHESIS OF CASE STUDIES

Anthony H. Pascal

The first thing we note about career education based on our visits to nine projects around the country was its essential weakness as a treatment. It began in the late 1960s in Washington, D.C. and elsewhere as a fairly revolutionary idea; schools were failing to prepare students for the world of work, and a gamut of integrated programs had to be developed so that schools could fill this role. The schools were to be opened up. Children were to learn the connection between what they were being taught and what they would have to know to earn a living. Many assumed that education would become generally more "relevant," where relevance was defined to include lessons that are useful and practical in ordinary life. To do this would require fundamental reformation in curricula at all levels of schooling.

Changes were to take place that would transform the schools. Children would learn outside the classroom and especially at employment sites. The classroom teacher would be supplemented by other adults with more vivid or more specialized knowledge of economic life. Projects would give children concrete and dramatic contact with various sorts of careers and their interrelationships. Comprehensive

DESCRIPTION OF CASE STUDY SITES

Tip County is a rapidly growing southern suburban area. The community is middle class to upper middle class, and white-collar employment is provided in a neighboring large city. The black student population is less than 10 percent. (Federally administered project.)

Coaltown, a small isolated mountain community in the heart of the Appalachian coal belt, has become relatively prosperous since the oil shortage. Although the minority population is small, there is a surprisingly high fraction of welfare families. (Federally administered project.)

Midville is a prosperous small city in the heart of the upper Midwest industrial region. The community is blue-collar and predominantly middle class. Blacks constitute about a quarter of the school system's 14,000 students. (State-administered project.)

Eastplace is a small northeastern town of about 35,000. Though located near a major metropolitan center, the community – largely working class or lower middle class – works locally in light industry. (State-administered project.)

Bikson County, located in the "New South," is composed of urban, suburban, and a few rural communities such as Victor, which was selected for the career education project because it was the most economically depressed and isolated part of the county. Blacks constitute one-third of the population and half of the school enrollment. (Federally administered project.)

Lakewood, one of the largest cities in the country, is located in the upper Midwest. It is heavily industrialized. The city is divided east-west between blacks (one-third of the population) and whites (largely ethnic). (Federal-and-state-administered projects.)

Northshore is a large seaport city in the West. Its population of over 500,000 is predominantly working class, with significant fractions of blacks and orientals. (Federal-and-state-administered projects.)

and pertinent collections of career materials would be placed in every school; teachers would draw on them in preparing lessons, and students would utilize them in researching career-related questions, assigned or self-motivated. Similarly, extensive materials deposits would aid school counselors, whose entire orientation would shift from concern with courses and credits and college catalogs to concern with work experiences and vocational requirements and lifetime career plans.

Had these things really been attempted, many people would have felt threatened and resistance would have been strong. As it turned out, opposition was minimal. In those places (see section on Coaltown) where proponents at first came on like revolutionaries, teacher reactions resulted in substantial retreat and modification. When program managers confronted secondary school teachers of "solids," who have large intellectual and emotional investments in the academic purity of their subjects, the managers withdrew, often even before any battle occurred. Parents were soothed by being told that the careers approach was merely another aspect of social studies or a source of after-school jobs and that Johnny would still be outfitted for college. Vocational teachers got new equipment and were asked to develop new awareness courses, and this made them less resentful about the invasion of their turf.

Between its conceptualization in Washington and a few innovative state education agencies and districts, and its subsequent widespread installation with Vocational Education Amendments (Part D) funds, career education stopped being a revolution and became merely another enrichment program, often short-lived and mostly insignificant, at least according to the projects we visited.

None of this is to say that some local projects did not work significantly better than others. In some LEAs (local education agencies) different things are happening in classrooms and libraries and counselors' offices than before. They don't happen every day and no one seems transformed by their occasional occurrence, but they do constitute a departure. And the careers approach may take root in such places and grow in intensity as children who first become exposed in early elementary grades filter up the system with enhanced interest and receptivity.

We must also recognize that we have been examining the first round of projects. Mistakes were made as staffs learned to organize and conduct their projects. There was no history to fall back on, hardly any opportunity to profit by the example of a neighbor's mistakes. That this feature is important is demonstrated by facts: Projects with more explicit and longer planning periods did better; second-round projects are seeking to derive lessons from their predecessors.

Below, under each of the broad activity headings we used in describing the individual experiences, we try to sum up what happened in the LEAs we visited. Then in each category we attempt to derive lessons for furthering career education in particular, and the innovative process in general.

INITIATION

Career education projects may be administered directly by a group within the United States Office of Education (USOE)--these are called federal or Commissioner's projects--or they may be administered by the staffs of state education agencies (SEAs) who receive the funds directly through a congressionally mandated formula.[*] Federally administered projects had budgets of about $150,000 per year; state-administered projects varied considerably in funding. The career education group in USOE exerts certain standards on projects it administers by choosing among proposals from competing districts within a state and by monitoring over time the projects it approves. The Washington staff exerts little control over career education projects funded out of the states' share of VEA Part D monies, and the amount of control imposed by the individual states varies widely, although it is nowhere very high.

Our sample of fieldwork sites was so small that we were unable to draw strong conclusions about the preferred site of administration. Of the four state-administered projects, one was excellent; a second was promising; and two a bit better than mediocre. Of the five Commissioner's projects, one was outstanding; a second was only fair; and the remaining three quite poor. It must be noted, however, that in all four lower-ranked federal projects there was strong participation by intermediary institutions--Model Cities agencies, university groups, or both. We comment below on the net disadvantage such intermediation seems to entail. In sum, the small sample and various complicating factors make it impossible to render a judgment as to the relative efficacy of federal versus state administration in the first-round career education projects.

Picking the right sites seems essential to us for project success. All of the relatively successful projects we visited were located in comfortable suburbs or prosperous smaller cities (e.g., Tip County and Midville). Large cities exhibiting symptoms of the "urban crisis" (e.g., Northshore and Lakewood), and small isolated towns or rural areas (Coaltown and parts of Bikson County) did not do nearly so well. Eastplace fell somewhere in the middle. It is suburban but not affluent. Its career education project was neither a standout nor a disaster.

---

[*] See Sec. I of this appendix for additional details on career education project funding and administration.

One interpretation of this relationship is that big cities and rural areas have so many other problems--among them student discipline, deteriorating plants, isolation, inadequate budgets, teacher militancy--that they really find it impossible, institutionally, to organize and carry out such innovations. They are willing, of course, to accept subsidies for programs with the word innovation in the title. Another interpretation is that well-financed middle-sized systems simply tend to go in for innovation. They are constantly changing themselves, at least in non-threatening ways, and have learned how to do it. Some perverse evidence for this point was provided by Eastplace, where teachers at first opposed career education because they were generally fed up with innovations per se, and with all of the upset and extra work they tend to cause.

The implication of this observation is that to field test and refine an innovative idea, money is best spent in the type of district that needs it least. Equity/efficiency trade-off dilemmas are well known in policy analysis, although a way to resolve them technically has not been discovered.

All of the good projects also had good project directors. The point is obvious, and its future policy relevance is unclear. We did find cases in which good leaders involved themselves in day-to-day operations and others in which the ostensible leader merely ran interference for a well-selected team. Necessary qualities, then, are difficult to pre-specify. One possible lesson is that in the future, granting authorities should try to ensure that the project director listed in the proposal has a demonstrated record of good performance. This, however, would work against the emergence of young inexperienced directors, and in any case "good" performance as defined by the LEA administration may not accord with the preferences of higher level authorities interested in financing real change.

There were a few cases in which independent intermediary institutions stood between the LEA and the federal granting authorities. In the cases of Coaltown and Bikson County, these were university school of education groups. In the federal projects in Northshore and Lakewood, they were local Model Cities agencies. In general, cases in which independent organizations drafted the proposal worked out relatively badly; cases where they also provided project direction worked out even worse. School administrations, like other organizations, seem to need to feel that a thing is really theirs before they will give it the support and sustenance it requires. Perhaps this is a manifestation of bureaucratic self-centeredness, perhaps a result of a hard-headed recognition that temporary grafts are just that, and therefore attention and resources are best allocated elsewhere. Even if the reasons cannot be determined, it seems clear that whenever possible USOE should work with the LEA itself.

To go below the LEA level, however, and to work directly with a given principal or group of teachers also carries risks. Such flanking movements are viewed with suspicion "downtown" and can have results similar to those described above.

It is highly desirable to involve school building personnel in the earliest possible phase of the project for two reasons. First, when projects are developed by staff people in the central administration of the LEA or by outside experts from teachers' colleges or foundations, they can become so super-logical and hyper-rational as to almost fade away into abstruseness. Even when the projects are coherent, they are often simply not workable because they lack the leavening of practical experience about what can actually be done in a classroom or school resource center. Second, teachers rightly resent receiving orders from on high about the way they are to conduct their classes. The more experienced the teacher, and usually the bigger and more cosmopolitan the district, the stronger the resentment.

Thus teachers, librarians, counselors, aides, and even principals have something to contribute to project planning, and to secure their cooperation in implementation, it is necessary to demonstrate a belief in that potential contribution. Pre-service staff development sessions should not be occasions for one-way instruction from project staff to school personnel; true interchange of ideas will make for projects that are both better conceived and more likely to flourish.

One lesson came through strongly: Pre-planning has a large payoff. In both Tip County and Midville, state funds were secured a year in advance of the arrival of federal Part D monies and were used to plan the project, assemble its staff, and train teachers and specialists. USOE's three-year grant period approach in which program design and operations were to begin simultaneously in the first year (i.e., in those few cases in which the grant was actually received before school opening in the first year) proved to be infeasible. Thus the first year of presumed operations became, in fact, a design period, and the program had only two years' real trial or, in many cases, one to one and a half years because of late receipt of funds. In the closing year, demoralization, if not actual disintegration, begins to ensue in many projects. This agenda seems simply inadequate for developing projects which can then be expected to find homes in the host LEA.

But, it remains an open question as to how much of the planning ought to be truly developmental and how much ought simply to be a process of assembling resources to be used in ways that were determined previously and elsewhere. In other words, how well does local autonomy work in the structuring of projects? The career education projects had a complicated history in this respect.

The proposal guidelines put out by USOE suggested that the LEAs would have a good deal of freedom in developing the projects. Informal negotiations between sites and USOE made it clear that USOE expected pretty close adherence to a set of specific treatments utilizing a series of predetermined methods. Negotiations with projects financed out of the allotment for Model Cities were conducted as if USOE never expected any such adherence. They almost seem to have been written off as a political cost of the program. But even for the other projects, not much was done after approval to ensure compliance to USOE's concept of career education. We came across no cases in which federal monitors mandated redirections in projects that departed from the career education ideal. Note, for example, in the case studies of Sec. IV below the very clear deemphasis of secondary school activities in most projects as they went along.

Local initiative and problem-solving ability were to have been the strengths of the program. They were vaunted as such in write-ups of USOE's career education program. The fact that career education, as revealed in our nine Part D case examples, failed to take in most of the places where it was initiated does not provide strong support for this mode of program administration.

Criteria to select schools for participation in the project varied so extensively that it is difficult to draw generalizations. Model Cities career education projects often featured the very worst schools in terms of achievement and discipline (Lakewood, Northshore). The projects seemed unable to overcome these disadvantaged contexts. The experience with rural schools was similarly unpromising (Bikson County). Midville, on the other hand, concentrated on Title I schools with apparent success. Smaller districts (Eastplace, Coaltown) went district-wide from the beginning. Tip County was the only one to choose a cluster of pilot schools, which appeared to offer the greatest likelihood of success. The criteria used there involved (1) whether or not the schools had vocational education experience and (2) the principals' and teachers' attitudes toward career education. Although our sample is hardly adequate to draw firm conclusions, this last mode (i.e., basing selection on objective, efficiency-oriented factors) seems superior, which is not very surprising.

IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of projects showed much similarity from district to district. Training of school staff by means of in-service sessions, finding and preparing specialists, coordinators and aides, arranging for field trips and resource speakers and classroom projects, assembling materials for career resource centers were required in all the LEAs that had career education projects.

In the better projects, materials tended to be developed on site rather than acquired elsewhere. Instruction units were written by teacher-volunteers and contributed to a common depository (although the latter was done less frequently than we anticipated). Films and tapes were produced locally and reflected local conditions. Descriptive literature and even sample job application forms were collected from local employers. All of these actions characterized the relatively successful projects. In the others there was an effort to secure pre-packaged materials from other districts or from the SEA or from publishers. The quest was often futile because not much of good quality was available in the early years. It is to be expected that the completion of the first round of USOE projects, the activities of NIE in the career education field, and the interest of commercial suppliers will make materials assembly less difficult for second-generation projects. On the other hand, there was undoubtedly something gained both in terms of knowledge and esprit de corps in the process of producing materials, however redundant much of the activity might have been. And some materials of local origin will always be required to make the project germane to local job market and educational conditions.

Staff development activities in some places consisted of two weeks of in-service training and in other places as little as three hours. In general, and very roughly, the longer the better. This is especially true in the start-up phase, which often occurs in a cluster of pilot schools. Training periods can be shortened as the kinks are worked out and as the faculty, through informal communication, becomes acclimated to whatever new ideas they are exposed to.

The better projects (Midville, Tip County) tended to have looser goals for their staff development sessions. The intention was not so much to ensure that teachers absorbed the elements of a prescribed approach to career education as to get them to appreciate the importance of the connection between education and work and to devise their own methods for making the connection concrete to students.

In all cases teachers were recompensed for at least part of the time spent in pre-service. In some cases they were not paid for time spent preparing the new lesson plans or instructional units required for careers orientation. This seems to us a false economy, because it lowers teacher morale. It may be particularly useful to compensate secondary teachers in such fields as English, mathematics, social studies, and science who are the most resistant to curriculum reformation.

A more fundamental point, however, relates to the notion that really basic changes in school curriculum--the central idea in the original career education concept--can be brought about through a few days' worth of teacher training in the summer. If one believes that effective career education entails a radical revision in curriculum, then more than missionary work, in-service, and midnight oil will be required. First, teacher training in schools of education will have to be changed to reflect these concerns. Then subject matter curriculum supervision at the LEA level must be brought into line. Finally, administrators and principals will have to be convinced that teachers who attempt career-oriented education will be rewarded in terms of promotions and privileges, or at least in terms of provisions for field trips and other supplementary activities for their classes.

The projects learned little or nothing from what was going on elsewhere. Mostly, of course, this was because nothing had been clearly established elsewhere; it was still in process. Even so, we never encountered anyone who got much value out of attending a career education conference (typical response: "Well it might have benefited the other attendees since we told them about all the good things we were doing here") or anyone who had even once used the ERIC system to keep up with colleagues' progress (typical response: "What's that?").

The vocational education staffs of the SEAs made virtually no contribution to any projects we visited (except, perhaps, in one state, where Tip County is located). This lack was as characteristic of state-administered projects as it was of commissioner's projects. Advice, leadership, guidance, warnings--none of these seemed to be within the capabilities of the state offices. Again, there are at least two reasons. First, the idea was so new that SEA people were unprepared to render advice. Second, vocational educators, who were typically put in charge of the states' career education offices, seem to feel both skeptical and suspicious about the idea of career education. They see it as a potential diversion of resources away from their primary concern--skill training--and many of them doubt the effectiveness of the approaches adopted.

It is somewhat disconcerting, then, to discover how much attention is paid by federal officials to the SEAs in this program. Approval, monitoring, and coordination of LEA projects are ostensible responsibilities of the state-level departments of vocational education. Yet it is difficult to discover any real and sustained contributions by these units. This may change with time, but one perceives no substantial and organized effort to educate state-level people on the purposes and preferred instrumentalities of career education. Currently, the chief SEA function seems to be to take a piece off the top.

But what could the SEAs usefully do in this arena to directly enhance the success probability of career education projects and to make the environment generally more conducive to true innovation? In many states, laws, rules, and practices make it difficult for career education projects to operate. Restriction on use of certain vocational education funds for disadvantaged students is one example. The SEAs could work to get changes in, or exceptions made to, such rules. State departments could perform a valuable function in fronting for locals vis-a-vis the federal agencies, as well, in situations where departures from standard practice seem justified. Finally, the SEAs could operate much more effectively as organs of information exchange. There is no need for every district in the state to make the same mistake, but feasible solutions developed in one LEA do not necessarily come to the attention of other interested districts. Technical assistance, conferences, workshops, and the like on the state level can make real contributions.

The counter-productivity of rigid implementation formulas has been alluded to earlier. Identifying goals, objectives, processes, and milestones to organize instruction and measure achievement in a complex integrated network is what is sometimes intended. These schemes not only tend to turn teachers off in a program which relies on their enthusiastic cooperation, but their validity depends on a much more sophisticated evaluation technology than either the state of educational theory or the institutional nature of public school systems is likely to permit.

In secondary schools, problems of implementation emerged not only as a result of teachers' indifference. It appears that not nearly enough time was set aside for true curriculum revision. Without released time or overtime, secondary teachers who did participate tended to adopt the least costly solution; they simply parroted prepared mini-lectures on the philosophy of career education. The result was that a student was likely to hear the same message repeated over and over in a succession of classes. This procedure virtually guarantees the discouragement of young people.

MAINTENANCE AND ADAPTATION

Maintenance of the projects funded under VEA, Part D, in both the federal- and state-administered versions was a significant problem. In many projects, especially those administered by USOE, start-up was delayed. Typically this meant, in effect, the loss of the first year of operations in many of the LEAs (Lakewood, Northshore, Coaltown, and Bikson County). In those projects that hired special new staff (this applies most directly to Model Cities-set aside projects), the project employees began to think about and look for new jobs during the third year of the project. Thus, full and committed treatment in many places occurred only during the second year of the project.

Problems of the secondary schools have been alluded to many times in this report, and we will not repeat the reasons why they occurred. Even in the best projects--Tip County, Midville--there was little visible impact on junior and senior high schools. Interestingly, it was in one of the more mediocre projects that some reform in secondary teaching actually seems to have been maintained. In Coaltown, this relative success was probably due to the superintendent's interest in shaking up instructional methodology. And he was on the scene where he could make sure that the career education project did, in fact, have this wider effect. Elsewhere, it was extremely difficult to convert secondary-level teachers to the idea of the importance of career applications. Even in places where some initial headway was made, there was little persistence.

We were able to discover no projects in which evaluation results had a noticeable impact on operations. This was true for at least two reasons. First, there was usually an unbridgeable gap between the goals and style of the evaluators and those of the people running the program. The evaluators' work was usually too abstract for the educators, but disagreements seemed to emerge on other questions as well and were not restricted to the usual tension between evaluator and evaluatee. Second, no one seems to have taken the responsibility of translating evaluation findings into revisions of operations. Only USOE could have performed this function, but its staff was hardly adequate in size to do so.

The degree of project support from central LEA officials varied widely. Concern and attention, troubleshooting, extra dollops of resources appear to be essential to the maintenance of innovative programs, but they took place only in projects with certain kinds of initiation histories. Projects run through intermediary groups from outside the schools were especially likely to have been slighted by district officials.

Principals, administrators, and teachers we spoke with agreed that the role of the building principal is essential to the success of innovative programs. We detected a certain ambivalence, however, on the part of most of the principals we interviewed. They are caught between the enthusiasm of project directors who also represent the power of the headquarters office and the natural conservatism of teachers who resent being told that their current approach to teaching is not valid and who are weary of the upset occasioned by the constant pressure to innovate that has occurred in recent years. The principals thus appear wary; they will endorse projects pushed by the LEA authorities but are reluctant to say that their excellent staff had not been doing these fine things, in one form or another, all along. It is rarely possible to identify what actions the principals took that actually helped a project. They usually permit action to take place in the school in response to the district's suggestions when they find teachers willing to shoulder the burden.

Often a principal's distance from the project is a function of his short tenure on the job. In most schools we visited, the principal had appeared on the scene after the project had begun, which reduced his personal commitment. Then why is the principal's role seen as so important? Partly because we observed that those few schools in which principals were self-proclaimed and dedicated proponents of the career education project almost invariably had the best projects. (An elementary school in Eastplace comes particularly to mind.) Interesting approaches, novel departures, enthusiastic participation characterized these projects. The lesson seems to be as follows: avid support by the principal is crucial but is very difficult to engage.

CONTINUATION AND DISSEMINATION

State support seems necessary for both continuation and effective dissemination. Without vocational education subsidies from the SEA, local systems will not continue the projects. The many competing demands on budgets and the still peripheral image of career education combine to make it a relatively low priority item. And the projects do need support to continue. Funding is required for field trips and speakers and classroom projects, for extra counselors and work experience coordinators, and, most important, to make available specialists who will dedicate their time to helping teachers with curriculum. Teachers face so many pressures to incorporate new approaches that to expect them to continue giving attention to career education without assistance is unrealistic.

In the early days of the career education movement, Grant Venn suggested that no LEA receive a grant unless it could demonstrate intention to continue the program beyond the federal grant period. This suggestion was not adopted. We would go further and suggest that no grants be given unless the district could demonstrate convincingly the ability and commitment to continue the innovation. The promise of state support, for example, should be contingent on the achievement of prespecified results by the end of the federal grant period as revealed by formal evaluation. This presupposes, of course, a more valid kind of evaluation than we have yet seen in career education projects.

Interdistrict dissemination seems to us the natural function of the SEA. Successful local projects should serve as examples to other interested districts. Failures, too, can be informative. But working out ways to transmit these lessons between LEAs is appropriately the arena for state action. The primary reason, of course, is that the districts themselves have no particular incentive--except, occasionally, pride in performance--to expend time and resources on the dissemination function.

Dissemination within the school system, e.g., from pilot schools to the rest of the district, can quite properly be left to local project directors. Districts that developed good projects, we found, were interested in extending them, given, of course, that the financial wherewithal was also available.

CONCLUSIONS

Since this entire section has been an attempt to derive conclusions, this summary simply reiterates the major points addressed earlier:

- Career education in its current development phase is a fairly weak and mild program treatment made up of standard components. It has generated little opposition except by teachers of academic courses who have resisted incorporating "vocational" concerns.
- Many LEAs used career education to try to achieve other, and to them more important, ends--for example, humanizing the schools, mobilizing the community, opening education to innovation, finding jobs for the deserving, teaching life management, acquiring outside funds, and improving vocational skill training.
- Projects that had a period of advance planning prior to the receipt of the federal grant had significantly higher levels of success.
- A major career education objective--change in the approach and behavior of teachers and counselors--occurred only in a few places and there rather intermittently.
- Local autonomy in the structuring of individual projects did not seem to contribute much to the overall quality of the project design.

- Early and authentic participation by school level staff in project conceptualization, however, is necessary to engage the cooperation of the actual implementers.
- The filter-up strategy in which the receptivity to career-oriented education is to increase as students exposed in their primary years move up the grade ladder is still only a hypothesis.
- The disinclination to confront seriously the resistance to career education in secondary schools may therefore have been a grave strategic error.
- Use of outside agencies such as universities and local action groups as intermediaries between USOE and the local schools has not generally been a successful approach.
- LEAs in comfortable (and mainly suburban) situations had more positive innovation experience.
- Projects in which neither federal officials nor local authorities made much attempt to monitor operations (e.g., the Model Cities–set aside projects) did significantly worse.
- For purposes of testing the efficacy of an innovative approach, projects probably ought to be installed in the most promising and not the most deserving schools.
- A tendency to develop materials locally characterized the best projects, but this may well fade in importance as the nation gains experience with career education.
- Much more serious and much more sustained attention must go into curriculum revision if career education is to take in secondary schools.
- SEAs will have to overcome their ignorance of and skepticism about career education and should facilitate career-oriented innovation in local systems by working for appropriate changes in procedures and by working at interdistrict information exchange.
- True commitment by principals is very difficult to attain but seems to be associated with good school performance in this class of innovation.
- For all practical purposes, state financial support is critical to the continuation of projects and perhaps ought to be pledged in advance of the federal commitment to a LEA.

IV. CASE STUDIES

TIP COUNTY IV-3
  Introduction IV-3
  Initiation IV-4
  Implementation IV-6
  Adaptation IV-8
  Continuation/Dissemination IV-9
  Conclusions IV-10

COALTOWN IV-12
  Introduction IV-12
  Initiation IV-13
  Implementation IV-15
  Adaptation IV-17
  Continuation/Dissemination IV-18
  Conclusions IV-18

MIDVILLE IV-20
  The Setting and the School System IV-20
  Initiation IV-22
  Implementation IV-23
  Maintenance and Adaptation IV-25
  Continuation and Dissemination IV-26
  Conclusions IV-27

EASTPLACE IV-30
  The Setting and the School System IV-30
  Initiation IV-31
  Implementation IV-32
  Maintenance and Adaptation IV-35
  Continuation and Dissemination IV-37
  Conclusions IV-38

BIKSON COUNTY IV-40
  The Setting and the School System IV-40
  Initiation IV-41
  Implementation IV-43
  Maintenance and Adaptation IV-44
  Continuation and Dissemination IV-46
  Conclusions IV-48

LAKEWOOD IV-49
  Characteristics of Schools and School District IV-49
  Initiation IV-50
  Implementation IV-53
  Maintenance IV-55
  Continuation/Dissemination IV-56
  Conclusions IV-59

NORTHSHORE IV-60
  Introduction IV-60
  Initiation: Arthur (Federally Administered) IV-61
  Initiation: State Project IV-63
  Implementation: Arthur IV-65
  Implementation: State Project IV-66
  Adaptation: Arthur IV-66
  Adaptation: State Project IV-67
  Continuation/Dissemination: Arthur IV-67
  Continuation/Dissemination: State Project IV-67
  Conclusions IV-68

TIP COUNTY

Anthony H. Pascal

INTRODUCTION

Tip County public schools operate in a rapidly suburbanizing county at the southwest corner of the Scoreton metropolitan region. The system enrolls about 45,000 children. It includes all of the county outside the city of Deerville, the county seat, but cooperates in sharing various facilities, including a vocational school, with the Deerville system. There are 35 elementary schools, 6 middle schools, and 9 high schools in the Tip County system.

Most of the county is made up of middle class to upper middle class families, the breadwinners of which commute to white collar jobs in Scoreton. A rural remnant of rather lower socioeconomic status remains in the county, concentrated in the western portion where the developers have not been as active. The black proportion of the student population is quite small, about 7 to 10 percent (this contrasts with the Scoreton city schools which are majority black).

Surprisingly, given the socioeconomic conditions in Tip County, only about 35 percent of the high school leavers go on to post-secondary educational institutions, down from about 60 percent five years ago. The reasons are allegedly the end of the draft, the deterioration in the job market for B.A. s and the success of the career education program in giving students a sense of the worthiness of vocations.

Neither career nor vocational education appears to have been an important emphasis in Tip County much before the onset of the federal career educatior project. The system has the characteristics of what had been a relatively sleepy rural operation rapidly adapting itself to the requirements of a modern, affluent, with-it suburban existence. The community suddenly was concerned, involved, generous, and watchful where previously its stance toward the schools had been passive and respectful, but niggardly. This opening-up, however, had the effect of permitting an approach like career education to have considerable leeway and scope for development. Unlike any of the other local education agencies (LEAs) we visited, in Tip County career education appears to be their "thing," whereas another district might adopt as a central thrust individualized instruction, or back-to-the-fundamentals, or process education, or whatever. This should not be taken to imply, however, that the career approach has transformed the schools. Nothing ever really does, and career education, as we argue in Sec. III above, will simply not bear so heavy a weight, at least as currently envisioned.

INITIATION

Although career education had no particular adherents in Tip County before the beginning of the project, it had firm friends of long standing in the state department of education. An official in the office of vocational education was, along with Grant Venn, one of the early originators of the idea of career education. In 1969, he coauthored a pamphlet that was to become one of the bibles for the preparation of career education grant proposals.

Meanwhile, an ex-aircraft engineer, later to become director of the Tip County project, made a splash as an innovative vocational education teacher at Kelton High School in Tip County. Personable, dynamic, and ambitious, he was invited to join the state education agency (SEA), where he was put in charge of curriculum development for vocational education for the state. His superior, realizing that USOE was about to launch the first round of Part D funding for career education projects, proposed that he go back to Tip County, prepare a proposal that would receive the endorsement of the SEA as a necessary condition, and then run the project.

The new director brought back some state dollars as well as the promise of an endorsement for the federal application. These monies were used in the 1969-70 school year for what was called a developmental phase, which permitted the conceptualizing, literature review, planning, material assembly, and staff training. Thus, when the federal grant began in September 1970, Tip County was ready to roll.

The application for the federal grant appears to have been prepared during this developmental phase. The director recruited a two-person team, both of whom had been classroom teachers. One is bright, articulate, and genial, and dedicated to the aims of the career education movement but with a leavening of practical realism in knowing how to manipulate the system in the direction of change. The other team member appeared less enthusiastic and less able; he may have simply been recruited to fill a gap and probably had less to contribute to the planning phase. Of course, help from the SEA was available whenever needed, given the very close relations with the project director.

The major existing program with relevance to career education in the district was another state effort called C&ES (Career and Education Study), which offered junior high school students the opportunity to explore and study community employment sites. It was installed at the participating junior high and was coordinated with the federal career education project.

Career education in Tip County had the components and treatments prescribed by the guidelines of the Pilot and Demonstration Branch, BAVTE, USOE. The non-Model Cities commissioner's programs tend to be the most standardized of all those sponsored. The federal project in Tip County is probably the classic case of this subcategory. The usual activities--curriculum reform, field trips, resource speakers, counseling reorientation, work/study experiences, classroom projects--were planned for the typical program structure based on career awareness in the elementary schools, orientation in the middle schools, and exploration plus preparation in the senior high. The changes in students sought as objectives of the program included:

- Awareness of one's own characteristics and their relation to the environment.
- Perception of relationships between self and school, home, and community.
- Practical application of academic concepts.
- Consideration of alternatives in occupational aspirations.
- Attainment of skills in decisionmaking.
- Familiarity with vocational courses through experimental sampling.
- Preparation in an occupation or the formulating of a personal post-secondary plan to acquire such preparation.

To develop a system that would attain these goals, the initiation phase was used to identify appropriate objectives and means at each level, review the availability of materials, and make provisions for implementation, evaluation, and dissemination.

The Kelton High School attendance area was chosen as the site for the pilot phase of the federal career education project. (It is interesting to note that the Tip County crew from the beginning saw the federal funds as supporting a "pilot" phase. It was simply part of their strategy to assume that this was to be followed by an "expansion" phase to the remainder of the district schools using state and local funds.) Besides Kelton High, the attendance area contains a middle school and four elementary schools. This attendance area was chosen for three reasons: (1) It represents a cross-section of students, staff, and facilities typical of the district. (2) Kelton High has adjacent to it a vocational campus, which was at first thought to be valuable to the project. (3) All of the principals were highly receptive and enthusiastic. Whether the fact that the project director had once taught at Kelton Vocational had any bearing on its selection is a subject for speculation.

We could uncover no opposition to the project in the community. In fact, the response of business, civic, and labor groups in the community was described as "unbelievably positive." This is a community which values its schools and wants to improve them. At the same time it is still probably more receptive to professional opinion as to preferred educational practice than would be a similarly comfortable suburban area in the North. Thus, groups in Tip County not only hosted visits and sent speakers, but in many cases contributed materials, supplies, and equipment for career-connected school projects of all sorts.

Perhaps the one source of resistance, if not opposition, was among the same groups we have noted in visiting other career education projects across the country--the secondary school teachers of the "solids" (i. e., English, mathematics, science, social studies). Time and time again we were told (although in Tip County the complaint was more muted) that these teachers feared their subjects would be sullied by introducing vocational concerns and applications. The companion complaint heard elsewhere, however--that teachers also rejected the extra work involved in creating new lesson plans--was seldom voiced in Tip County.

Which of the standard typologies of innovation--R&D, linkage, opportunism--best characterizes Tip County? The answer is complex. The system, as it were, was hoping that Tip County would become an R&D-type district--or at least so it would appear. Career education was in the air nationally and was even more fashionable in the state. Ideas were available; they merely needed packaging. Money was available; it merely had to be asked for. The district, it might be argued, was in search of a modernizing image. It all fit together. Tip County got the kind of school administration appropriate to its new population. Career education was the vehicle. Some alternative vehicle might have served the purpose at hand equally well. Career education just happened to be ready and waiting.

IMPLEMENTATION

In the four elementary schools, one volunteer teacher was chosen from each grade. They attended a 3-day orientation workshop in the summer of 1970 a week before school opened. Each teacher was asked to implement one career development unit per grading period. Elementary specialists helped the teachers prepare units and acquire necessary materials. Each unit was to incorporate hands-on activities, subject-tie-ins, resource persons, field trips, role-playing, and occupational awareness. The units covered such themes as newspapers, hospitals, construction, retailing, and the like. Through regularly scheduled in-service sessions, the teachers shared experiences and derived guidance from one another. Later, a full-time curriculum writer was recruited to help the teachers formulate their units.

By the 1972-73 school year all teachers in the pilot schools were participating, and "seed" teachers had been selected in each of the remaining "expansion" schools in Tip County.

The junior high school program seemed not to get off the ground until 1971-72. Each of the math, science, social studies, and language arts teachers was to draw up lessons that would demonstrate the relevance of subject matter to a particular unit topic. Flexible scheduling was to have facilitated this approach. Eighth grade students were involved in the C&ES and ninth graders were given sample experiences in vocational education. Both of these latter two devices seem to have predated the federal career education project; thus the curriculum revision was a marginal innovation. One does not get the feeling that real teacher participation and commitment emerged. The federal project, at the middle school level, seemed a decided disappointment.

At the high school they first attempted to design units that would relate academic and vocational courses. This proved intractable because of rigid scheduling. The next approach was to write new curriculum units to demonstrate the applicability of academic requirements to the students' career interests. This appeared somewhat more successful. It was claimed that the following factors stood in the way of really effective implementation at Kelton High School.

- The strict subject matter orientation of the teachers.
- The isolation of the academic campus from the vocational campus.
- The lack of firm administrative support.
- The inadequacy of course offerings at the vocational school.

A student placement service which was to offer counseling and help in securing part time and summer jobs and post graduation employment was also organized. Its operation seemed low profile and, we fear, low quality.

The Tip County people did not appear to have much regard for pre-packaged materials in career education. In general, it has been our experience that the better the project the more likely teachers are to want to produce their own curricular and supplementary materials. This, we believe, reflects an accurate perception of the quality of the available packaged materials at the time the first round of projects was casting about for help. Some audio-visual and library items were acquired, but by and large the federal project did not put the stress on career learning centers in the schools that state projects (e. g., Northshore, Eastplace) featured so strongly.

In the latter stages of the project, units were formalized after practical feedback from the classrooms and with the expert assistance of the curriculum writer. These have been distributed around Tip County and throughout the state. An interesting and almost self-administering pre-service session to orient new teachers for career education has also been developed.

The Tip County project has, from the beginning, had a very strong dissemination component. The project staff spends considerable (excessive?) time in answering queries, conducting visitors, and carrying the word to interested heathens. Given the implementation problem they faced in the middle and high school, they might have better spent their time in trying to solve that problem.

ADAPTATION

The major changes that occurred during the project all seemed to have to do with the desire to find something that worked at the junior and senior high school levels. This quest was not successful. It is difficult to ascertain in retrospect just how serious this attempt was; the fact that nowhere in the country has career education penetrated secondary school teaching in a meaningful way is evidence that the task is formidable indeed. Yet it was disappointing to learn how resigned to this failure the very effective project staff in Tip County had become.

Throughout its course the project got strong backing from the LEA headquarters office. The project director took as his task to perform liaison between the project staff and the superintendent's office and between the staff and the community. Wisely, he did not devote himself to basic planning or to day-to-day management of the project.

An evaluation was performed by an independent research/consulting agency affiliated with the school of education at a university in a nearby state. Third-party evaluations are mandated as part of the regulations governing the award of Part D Commissioner's grants. It is our impression that there was a definite mismatch in style between the project evaluators and the project operators. The Tip

County crew are down-to-earth, pragmatic, experience-based, and tend to see problems as solvable by better interpersonal relations; the evaluators tended to be highly theoretical, abstract, and enamored of logical coherence. For example, they conceptualized the project as having 6 product goals, which led to 19 product objectives, which were connected with 11 process goals to be reached through 6 process objectives. This kind of formalism didn't seem to impress the project staff. There was apparently little or no connection between evaluative findings and project revision.

Staffing of specialists at the secondary level seemed to be the source of greatest difficulty in maintaining the project. Turnover in these slots was a problem, and did not seem to result in satisfactory staff. For the elementary slots they seem to have gotten the best possible people. For the middle and high school slots they seem to have utilized less capable staff. Perhaps this has something to do with the relative success achieved at the different levels.

As time went on, the activity at the elementary schools became less and less curriculum revision and more and more hands-on projects. There were schools where making aprons and building birdhouses were billed, respectively, as introductions to the world of fashion and construction. Hands-on can easily degenerate into fun and games, which may have occurred in some Tip schools toward the end.

CONTINUATION/DISSEMINATION

The federal funds used to support the career education project stopped at the end of the regular three-year grant period. But the project effort continues. Its major task now is to apply the lessons learned during the course of the pilot project phase in the Kelton attendance complex into the other schools of the district. The project director now has another job. (He is assistant to the superintendent for public relations.) The staff has been reduced to one person who has responsibility for dissemination of materials and ideas and the conduct of in-service training. He claims he would like to add a high school specialist, one or more curriculum writers, and someone to work with counselors.

Whether or not this will happen depends on budget decisions soon to be faced by the Tip County Board of Education. The board had already taken a very significant step when, at its regular monthly meeting in March 1973, it adopted the following statement:

> The exemplary Tip County Occupational and Career Development Program has provided a philosophy for and a practical approach to bring about career development as one facet of a student's total growth.

> It is then our feeling that the processes and outcomes of the exemplary effort in Tip County are compatible with the overall philosophy of the Tip County Board of Education and that Career Education should be an integral part of the educational process for every student in Tip County [emphasis added]. -

The rhetorical commitment has been made. Will it be backed with resources? The answer probably depends more on the strength of competing pressures for funds than on community, administration, or board satisfaction with the federal project.

As mentioned earlier, requests for information and for permission to visit have run strong from the early days of the project. What has changed significantly since the cessation of the pilot phase, it appears, is the frequency with which project staff receive requests for visits to other districts. Staff members have organized workshops, seminars, and institutes on career education in all sections of the country where LEAs are preparing to adopt the philosophy. These have been helpful in promulgating the Tip County approach and have exposed the Tip County staff to a spectrum of educational problems. They have also been rewarding for the staff members who have been invited to visit.

CONCLUSIONS

Tip County is acknowledged by responsible federal officials, directors of counterpart projects, and knowledgeable observers to have had an outstanding career education project. Our visits confirmed that the federal project was indeed a standout. What was responsible for the success? The question, as usual, has a number of answers:

1. They had a head start. The project director worked in an SEA that was developing the original career education philosophy. This, plus the advantages of being funded for advance planning during 1969-70, put them a long way ahead of the competition.
2. The management style and senior personnel selections were fortuitous. The director kicked things off and then ran interference for the very able staffers he appointed. He let them make day-to-day decisions. All of the personnel had recently been classroom teachers, and this increased their rapport with teachers they worked with.
3. The district was enthusiastically supportive. Career education looked with-it and modern and they backed it. The district was also probably at

a very opportune stage of its development; large and growing and affluent enough to want to appear cosmopolitan, yet not so big or so urban as to have a cumbersome administrative bureaucracy or a militant and stand-pat teacher body.

4. The district, on the other hand, was facing no crises. School discipline was not a major problem, the teachers were not striking, finances were adequate.
5. They developed their own approaches and materials, which gave all involved a sense of participation. Teachers, when interviewed, tended to view themselves as part of the project and not as passive followers of instructions from above.
6. The approaches used were pragmatic and classroom tested. Luckily for Tip, the "outside" people could spout the buzz words necessary to get the grant and write reports that pleased the feds and the SEA, while the "inside" people were not burdened with a heavy theoretical superstructure.
7. Community support was excellent. In a project that calls, in part, for opening schools to the world of work, it is fortunate when that world welcomes incursions and responds with assistance. Some features of the Tip County scene exist elsewhere or could be engineered. Others are more or less unique to the historic, social, and political situation there. In Sec. III above, we attempt to derive some lessons that may be applied in federal and state grant programs for educational innovation.

COALTOWN

Anthony H. Pascal

INTRODUCTION

Tucked away in a hollow of the Appalachian Mountains, Coaltown is the seat of Coal County and, except for a few county and federal offices, exists only because of the many coal mines in the area. Thus the economic base of Coaltown is mining, with associated railroading, and the government offices. Retailing and professional services round out the picture. The recent boom in coal demand since the oil shortage has made Coaltown relatively prosperous, although a surprisingly large number of "coal millionaires" have always lived there. We saw several new houses under construction in the $250,000 price range in this small mountain city. At the same time there is a surprisingly high fraction of welfare families. The minority population is minuscule.

As isolated and unprepossessing as Coaltown appears, in it live the elite of Coal County, and its schools, in a relative sense, reflect this elevated status. When discussing men in their middle years, people will say, disparagingly, "I think he went to school in the county" (i. e., outside of Coaltown in the Coal County system) or, with admiration, "He graduated from Coaltown High!"

Until very recently, the system had been extremely traditional, with a heavy emphasis on self-contained classrooms, teacher-talks-kids-listen, paper-and-pencil education. Most teachers got their training at Coaltown College (a small denominational private school) or at one of the state university campuses. One or two teachers on the elementary school staff have never spent a night outside of Coal County.

At the same time, the system has been extremely academic-oriented. It is claimed that over 70 percent of the high school graduates go on to post-secondary education, a large fraction to Coaltown College, which specializes in teacher training and gives courses in mining technology. Although there are vocational schools in the county and in neighboring counties, they are little used by Coaltown students. One gets a strong feeling that the system is organized around the parental aspirations of Coaltown's managers, proprietors, and professionals, and that the needs of children of miners and clerks get shorter shrift.

The Coaltown system is organized on a standard pattern for small communities. There is an elementary school in a fairly new and modern building with about 600 students and about 30 teachers. Then there is a joint junior high/high school campus, under one principal, which has about 700 students and about 40 teachers.

The secondary school is in an ancient, uncharming cluster of brick buildings in the middle of the business district. A new campus is planned. The superintendent's office is in the high school; he runs his mini-system with a firm hand, treating his two principals, it would appear, as personal assistants.

Coaltown's mayor is an accomplished grantsman and has been adept at bringing federal money into the town, particularly for public works programs. Coaltown had received a Model Cities designation, which was instrumental, as we shall see, in channeling the career education project there.

A major event had occurred just prior to the receipt of the Part D grant. For years the school system had been girding itself to win accreditation from the Southern Association of Schools. This required considerable upgrading in teacher qualifications, curriculum, course offerings, library quality, and so on. Early in 1970, accreditation was granted and the school administration and faculty were in a self-congratulatory mood.

INITIATION

The mayor and the superintendent decided that Coaltown High School needed much more extensive vocational education facilities. Parents and students had been clamoring for it, even though until recently they had been ignored. The students were reluctant to leave their classmates and activities to be bussed 15 miles down the hollow to the county vocational school in Schlering. The town's Model Cities Agency had contributed some machinery and equipment to outfit shop and business education classrooms, but much more was needed. The Vocational Education Part D program looked like a possible angel.

The Model Cities people found a professor of industrial arts at a local campus of the state university to help prepare the grant proposal to USOE. A professor of occupational education at the same institution was subsequently named project director, although he continued to live 150 miles away. His university was made the official project grantee. Since Coaltown received the endorsement of the state department of education, receipt of the Part D grant was a foregone conclusion under the Model Cities set aside.

The grant received, a project staff was hired. Relevant experience did not appear to be one of the criteria employed in assembling the staff.

The staff was large compared with other projects we investigated, particularly in view of the relatively few students served. It consisted of:

1. The professor of occupational education as project director.
2. An elementary school curriculum specialist who doubled as on-site co-director.
3. A secondary school curriculum specialist.
4. A media specialist.
5. A testing and evaluation expert.
6. A vocational and placement counselor.
7. A resource specialist.

Since the local co-director did not arrive until October 1970, little happened until the early spring of 1971. The decision had been made to concentrate on the elementary school in the first year. Opening meetings between the project staff and the Coaltown Elementary School teachers were disasters. Not only was the professor overly theoretical and the co-director without recent experience in elementary school teaching, not to mention career education (she had been working in the local Head Start program), but they managed to convey to the teachers that the entire approach to teaching would have to be radically reformed by the end of the school year. Career Education was in! The three Rs were out! And this, only months after winning the long awaited accreditation by the Southern Association.

The teachers were quite hostile. Fortuitously, the professor's visits were cut back for a time. The co-director, an intelligent and personable woman, gradually won the teachers' confidence. It was explained that career education meant teaching with a new perspective, not totally replacing all previous teaching practices. Field trips would be planned and supervised; children would not fall down mine shafts. Resource speakers would be respectable and apposite; the classrooms would not be penetrated by outside agitators. The new materials would be supplements; cherished old textbooks need not be discarded.

Parents in Coaltown are not used to communicating with the people that run their schools. Even in this passive atmosphere, some initial resistance to the career project was noted in the community. It quickly disappeared when people learned more about it and recognized its putative advantages for their children.

IMPLEME[illegible]

The teachers [illegible] organized into in-service sessions and had an extensive summer workshop [illegible] school let out in June 1971. Although Coaltown teachers and principals had no [illegible] in the initial planning and preparation of the project, they did participate in writing instructional plans. A different focus was developed for social studies in each grade:

1st. Careers in the home: father's occupation and mother's work.

2nd. Careers in the neighborhood: local merchants and services.

3rd. Careers in Coaltown: workers and professionals.

4th. Careers in the schools: how teachers and administrators are prepared, supporting services, and health occupations.

5th. Careers in the United States: regional variations and what causes them.

6th. Careers in the world: connections with the foreign trade of the United States and of Coaltown and careers in communications.

Units were prepared by individual teachers on each of these themes, with the assistance of directors and curriculum specialists. One defect appeared to be the disinclination to share ideas among the teachers. This must have meant duplication of effort and failure to adopt some good teaching strategies. The media coordinator arranged for the assembly of printed and audio-visual materials. Field trips and resource speakers proved a much more difficult undertaking in Coaltown than in any other place we visited. The town is so isolated and the economy so specialized that there simply are not many interesting places to visit, nor is there a wide variety of informed people to invite in to speak with students. New lesson plans rather than hands-on projects seemed to be the preferred instructional mode in Coaltown.

In 1971-72, career education moved into grades 7 and 8; in 1972-73, grades 9-12 were the objective, although once started the project continued in all grades until the end of the project in June 1973. Movement of the project up the system proved much less traumatic than its introduction in the elementary school. It was no longer exotic and threatening, and the project staff had learned to work with teachers. The staff was of the opinion that the professor was appearing less and less frequently, and this, too, appeared to be a plus.

Junior high school teachers got a one-week summer in-service course in 1971 in which 90 percent of them were involved. Math and science courses were the early targets, but language arts and social studies teachers also participated. The secondary curriculum coordinator seemed to favor an approach in which actual mini-courses in career exploration were given in conjunction with longer courses in industrial arts and home economics. This seemed to work not nearly so well as the integration of career themes into academic courses. Field trips were scheduled to the coal laboratory, courthouse, medical center, and to Coaltown College. Accountants, ministers, engineers, businessmen, and policemen came and talked with students. In junior high classrooms almost a year after the project ended, career applications were still being pursued. The 8th grade English teacher was using the specialties involved in producing a newspaper to drive home the importance of communications arts; the 7th grade mathematics teacher attempted to relate mathematical concepts to the world of construction in terms the students seemed to understand.

On the high school level, the results were considerably less impressive. One handsome industrial arts shop was outfitted at this time, though not with Part D funds, and a greenhouse was built where students could conduct plant experiments. A placement counselor was hired, although he did not appear to have done anyone much good according to the students. He did, however, introduce work/experience classes, which have continued, and that seems a more promising innovation. The in-service training organized for high school teachers seems to have made little change in the way they taught their classes in 1972-73. Even that faint trace has disappeared by now.

This was a somewhat surprising result, given the superintendent's obvious interest in reforming the instructional styles of the teaching body. He said that he has long felt that teachers of agriculture, industrial arts, and home economics are generally superior in exposition and management of diversified materials than are teachers of the "solids." He wanted some of this expertise to transfer over and saw the careers project as a way to do it. It did not take; perhaps the one year exposure was too short, or perhaps the sessions were poorly operated. In any case an interesting and somewhat uncharacteristic quest was disappointed. The by now shopworn story was repeated concerning the typical high school teacher of academic subjects who is threatened by the suggestion that she include vocational material in her offerings.

ADAPTATION

Other than the sequential pattern in introducing career education up the grade ladder, not much in the way of adaptation seems to have occurred. The influence of educational theory tended to diminish as more experience-based approaches came to the fore. In the secondary schools, career exploration themes, when they were mentioned at all, were more likely to be integrated into courses than taught as a separate subject.

Thus the district did not have much effect on the project; the project, on the other hand, seems to have had a profound effect on the district. Over and over again, one is informed about the ways in which the careers project "opened up the school system in Coaltown." Especially in the elementary school, teachers began to see themselves, and their primers, less as the source of all knowledge and more as directors of learning. Opening the classroom to the world of work also opened it to all kinds of other educational innovations. The superintendent, the principal, and virtually all of the teachers interviewed claimed that without the careers project, the series of innovative programs that followed in its wake could not have occurred.

The elementary school is now host to a Teachers Corps project in which interns from Coaltown College are serving as teachers-in-training (and change agents) in all classrooms. To the delight of some teachers, to the consternation of others, and to the exhaustion of all, they are introducing team teaching, individualized instruction, learning centers, peer teaching, educational contracts, and all of the other trendy concepts of recent educational history. In Coaltown, these ideas were discussed but were, until now, considered too heterodox to actually try. They got their feet wet with careers; now they are all in the swim (or in the soup!).

An unintended consequence of the Teacher Corps project is that the faculty are so involved in learning new techniques and styles that they claim, except for a stalwart few, to have no time for their poor old careers units. In visiting classrooms, we certainly did not get the feeling that much of anything remained.

The evaluation report, produced by the same university group that got the job for Tip County, has sunk without a trace and probably for the same reason as in the Tip County case. Hyperlogical but abstruse, it tended to evaluate positively the progress made in Coaltown but has had no apparent effect on the conduct of the project.

Evidence on the usefulness of assistance from federal officials was decidedly mixed. The superintendent and on-site project co-director denied that they did anything but supply the funds. The project director was effusive in his praise of

USOE support and advice but was rather evasive when pressed to give details. No one had anything very positive to say about the state education agency (SEA), but everyone recognized that the state department people were engaged in learning about career education during this time period and that, in the second round projects, they would be a much more valuable resource.

CONTINUATION/DISSEMINATION

What remains? Not much. Some library books and materials get used sporadically in the elementary school. The collection assembled for the secondary school is almost never touched. The Teacher Corps project has swept all preceding innovations before it at Coaltown Elementary. Some junior high teachers are perhaps somewhat more receptive to the notion of the occupational applications of their subjects. The high school guidance counselor might be more sensitive to, but is certainly no more capable of advising, the student who is not going to college. Students interviewed almost unanimously denied ever being aware that a careers program had been conducted. Some high school girls vaguely remembered a computer printout listing materials relevant to their expressed vocational interest; one ninth grade boy claimed he decided to become an accountant after a visit to the school by a local CPA.

What the students really wanted was

- Help in securing part-time jobs.
- Guidance in choosing vocations and in identifying necessary preparatory steps.
- Resource speakers who were both interesting and informative.

As to dissemination, Coal County schools indicated some interest in installing a careers project if they could get state funding. Nothing much seems to have happened. Some people from another county came over once to look around. Coaltown is simply too small and too isolated, and their project was too ineffectual to have made much of an impact on the outside world.

CONCLUSIONS

Like the other Model Cities-related projects we know about, the Coaltown operation seems to have been used to hire some people and to buy some vocational training equipment. Except for the claim concerning "opening up of the school," which is, clearly, nearly impossible to confirm, no one's welfare seems to have been advanced significantly as a result of the project in Coaltown. The major lessons seem to be:

- Appointment of a project director at an academic institution 150 miles away was a serious error.
- The initial, heavy-handed approach to the teachers almost killed the project.
- Reforms that occurred in the junior high probably had to do with the fact that the superintendent was on the scene and known to be interested in new educational styles.
- Professional help in curriculum revision, by people experienced in the subject area, is essential.
- To motivate secondary students, practical assistance in counseling and job placement is needed.
- Teachers and principals must be emotionally engaged early on and must be given the chance for meaningful participation in planning and project design.
- It may be that teachers cannot really integrate a new approach like career education unless they are conditioned as to its importance when they themselves take training.

Coaltown seems so atypical with respect to most of American public education, however, that it is difficult to say that much of value was learned from this not very successful project. It is certainly not a test bed the expert and unencumbered experimental designer would have chosen, but then perhaps every place is atypical. Does this suggest that innovative programs can only work if they are place-proof? If so, we certainly have not yet discovered how to develop such programs.

MIDVILLE

Richard F. Elmore

THE SETTING AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

Midville is located in the heart of the upper Midwest industrial region. Although the area immediately surrounding Midville is heavily industrialized, Midville proper is a pleasant, predominantly middle class, blue-collar community. Lower middle class and poverty-level families, black and white, are largely concentrated in one relatively small part of town. Four of the town's sixteen elementary schools are Title I target schools, and all are located roughly in this area. Blacks constitute the most substantial minority group in the community, about 25 percent of the school system's approximately 14,000 students. Somewhat less than one-third of the system's graduates go on immediately to post-secondary school, but the largest fraction of them move directly into local industry.

Midville schools have a sophisticated, well-developed vocational program, particularly at the high school level. About one-third of the town's newest high school is given over to facilities for vocational education, including metal and woodwork, automobile repair, horticulture, and business education. The school system's work experience program was one of the first in the state. It was established and administered for a number of years by the individual who presently directs the career education program. Vocational students from the Midville schools are apparently highly regarded by local business and industry; the placement rate is nearly 100 percent for students with some specialized vocational training.

The school administration group in Midville is made up of attractive, vital, and highly competent people. They are about equally divided between "locals" and "cosmopolitan," although this latter term should be used advisedly, since most have received their training and experience in the state where Midville is located. The predominant management style both within the central administration and between the central office and school principals is open, decentralized, and informal, with virtually no signs of deference to formal authority in relationships among administrators. All those interviewed spoke of their jobs as if they were primarily responsible for determining the nature of their own work. The present superintendent pursues an openly declared policy of "shared management," which emphasizes decentralized decisionmaking.

At the same time, central administrators and school-level personnel seem to share a very practical, common sense attitude toward innovation. With the possible exception of the director of the career education project, no one seemed to attach much value to innovation as an end in itself. They were not particularly concerned about impressing an outside observer with the innovative nature of what they were doing and spent very little time explaining or defending the uniquely "innovative" qualities of the school system or its programs. The predominant style was deliberate, direct, and understated. Activities were described as though they were the result of a straightforward application of common sense to a widely acknowledged problem.

The pivotal character in the Midville career education project is its director, He is the one self-consciously innovative actor we observed in the system. He is highly regarded and well-liked both by other administrators and by school-level personnel in the project. His entire professional career, more than 20 years, has been spent in the Midville schools. Beginning as an elementary and secondary teacher, he gradually worked his way up through the system to the point where he was given responsibility for a series of innovative programs in vocational education. He established and administered the system's occupational work experience program — the state's first. Prior to that he ran the system's land laboratory, a substantial amount of acreage deeded to the system by the military and used for a variety of purposes by elementary and secondary schools.

Despite deep ties to the locale, he is involved in a number of activities that take him outside Midville. He teaches periodically at a state university campus, sits on a federal advisory panel on career education for the handicapped, and is consultant to a number of publishers of career education curriculum materials. He has a great deal of autonomy in his present role, and he capitalizes on it.

The project director's immediate superior is the assistant superintendent for career education, who is young, earnest, and highly ambitious with a recent Ph. D. in administration and curriculum supervision. He has been in the system for six years. For him, career education is a comprehensive label that includes activities from pre-school through adult education. He took some care to explain that the K-10 career education project, funded by USOE through the state department, was only part of the system's career education program. Other activities included the land laboratory, industrial arts and home economics at the junior high level, high school vocational programs, work experience, and an adult job training program enrolling about 190 persons. He also indicated that counseling personnel, who had previously occupied an independent position in the system, had recently been subsumed under the career education program. This was regarded as an important reform, both by the assistant superintendent and the superintendent.

INITIATION

Midville's elementary-level career education program was begun in advance of the receipt of Vocational Education Amendments, Part D funds. Before the beginning of the 1969-70 school year, the system requested support from the state department's discretionary funds for education of the disadvantaged to launch a career education project. According to the assistant superintendent and project director, the state at first had serious reservations about this use of disadvantaged funds but finally agreed. In January 1970, a K-6 project was begun in four Title I schools with $40,000 in state funds. By this time the system had also applied to the state for funding from federal career education funds. This application was approved, and in the 1970-71 school year two more elementary schools were added to the original four, and a program was begun in one junior high. Funding during 1970-71 was $58,000. By 1973-74, the project had grown to $176,000 and included ten of the system's sixteen elementary schools, two of its three junior highs, and one of its two high schools. In the spring of 1974, the system applied to the state for more than $250,000 to continue the project and expand it to the remaining schools. Administrators seemed confident that the funds would be forthcoming.

The original idea for the project seems to have come from the assistant superintendent and the project director, who at that time was director of the work experience program. A committee composed of curriculum supervisors from the central administration, teachers, principals, and parents had a hand in developing the proposal, but the main impetus came from the assistant superintendent and the project director.

The broad outlines of the project are mandated by state department guidelines, Each project is to have three components: career motivation (K-6), which has the purpose of "developing in students a respect for all work, and the motivation to participate in the work of work"; career orientation (7-8), "to provide all students with observational and activity-centered experiences relative to career opportunities"; and career exploration (9-10), to provide "real or near real experiences in occupations or occupational facilities." The projects stop short of actual vocational training, and are designed to "prepare the student to make choices for vocational education or pre-professional education in grades 11-12."

During the earliest phases of the Midville project there was a brief flare-up of adverse opinion. Black and white parents in the Title I schools where the project was initiated objected to it on the grounds that their children were being tracked into vocational programs and blue collar jobs. A single meeting was held in which administrators discussed the project with parents; the meeting ended with an expression of support for the project by parents. No significant objections have been expressed since.

IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation strategy, an unusual combination of fairly systematic management and informality, appears to have been devised exclusively by the project director. One basic part is phased implementation: a few schools have been brought into the project each year and each successive group is at a different stage of development. Teachers from nonproject schools who have indicated an interest in career education are included in in-service training activities. The director said that he does not attempt to start a program in a given school until he has a small cadre of interested teachers who have been exposed to some in-service training.

Initially, the director said, training consisted of attempts to explain what career education was and how it should look in a given school. This approach was a failure, according to the director. He then settled on a more indirect approach, one aspect of which was to conduct a series of discussions on subjects indirectly related to career education: attitudes toward occupations, women's role in society, and value clarification. The purpose of these discussions is to stimulate an interest in a general social problem that can serve as a source of motivation for teachers to integrate career materials into the curriculum. Another aspect of the indirect approach is to rely increasingly on demonstrations using teachers and children from classrooms that have developed interesting career education activities. The latest example of this was a workshop for guidance counselors in which children and teachers did most of the "training."

The project is organized in a very systematic way. Each elementary school has a designated coordinator, who receives released time to work with other teachers in the building one day a week. That day, the teacher's class is run by a regular substitute, or co-teacher. The director anticipated resistance to this plan from building principals and parents, but there has been none. Each junior high has a coordinator, who is released two periods per day. Junior high coordinators are assigned a paraprofessional aide who works 30 hours a week. The high school program is run by a full-time coordinator, who is located in a career information center adjacent to the school library. In addition, the director has a central office staff of four paraprofessional aides — mothers of school-age children — who work about 30 hours a week and handle all routine relations with school coordinators: scheduling field trips, delivering requested materials, assigning new materials for review by teachers and coordinators, etc. Each aide has designated responsibility for about three schools and maintains daily contact with the coordinator in those schools.

While the organizational structure of the project is systematic and well-defined, determination of the substance of the program in each school is very informal and highly decentralized. This is another important feature of the implementation strategy. The director argues that career education is an inherently ambiguous notion and that the solution to this problem lies not in forcing it into a coherent framework but rather using the ambiguity to encourage teachers to try anything they think makes sense. The central staff and the coordinators exist to provide resources to teachers but are not charged with implementing a specific set of activities. The director sees his role as stimulating an interest in career education and providing some examples of activities, then leaving teachers and coordinators free to develop their own programs in each school.

Consequently, virtually any program idea is fair game, and there is a large quantity and variety of activity. Most elementary activities are heavily weighted with basic human relations content: improvement of self-image and self-confidence, learning about interdependencies of people in society, development of the notion that choices can be made about one's future, etc. The primary source of prepackaged materials at the elementary level seems to be the "Our Working World" (SRA*) series on the family, neighborhood, and city, and the SRA-focus self-development materials that stress affective and emotional development. These materials are well-used in a number of the elementary schools. One coordinator volunteered that her teachers had worn out one entire SRA set on the family — a relatively uncommon phenomenon, one suspects. There are also a large number of field trips taken to local industries, and one popular trip to a state university campus, where children work with college students on simple building and drafting projects. Since a number of the elementary children have participated in training workshops for teachers and counselors, they are highly articulate, self-confident, and independent in their descriptions and assessments of career education activities. All project schools have regular programs for bringing parents in to talk about their work.

---

*Survey of Reading Achievement.

At junior high and high school levels there seems to be somewhat less activity, but still a good deal of evidence that career-oriented programs have taken hold. One junior high had organized a summer job service for its students, and both junior highs in the project had made some headway in introducing career material into the curriculum. The main career education activity at the high school level is an Explorer Scouts club that served as the vehicle for introducing students to occupations in the community via a series of one-day visits. A high school art teacher, who is deeply involved in the career education program, has organized a group of high school students who teach arts and crafts to blind elementary students and to high school teachers in an after-school program. The school administration classifies some of these high school students as "disciplinary problems."

Combination of a well-defined organizational structure and a very informal and decentralized approach to program substance seems to have produced a substantial amount of career education activity in the Midville system. The one critical feature of this implementation strategy that cannot be generalized to other cases, however, is the personality and operating style of the director. The fact that most routine tasks of program administration are handled by paraprofessional staff of the central office leaves the director free to concentrate on in-service training and informal contacts with coordinators, teachers, and children.

MAINTENANCE AND ADAPTATION

The organizational structure of the project apparently serves fairly well as a maintenance device: schools that have been in the project the longest draw more extensively on the services of the in-school coordinators and the central staff. Coordinators and school principals agreed that the best way to implement and maintain a program within a school was to concentrate exclusively on those teachers who are most interested, and ignore the rest. They argued that the performance of teachers who have a high level of interest in the innovation has a demonstration effect for teachers who are marginally interested, and results in a high level of interest in the school as a whole. It is a waste of time and resources to concentrate any effort on hard-core holdouts, they argued.

There has been no adaptation of the basic organizational structure since the beginning of the project. The kind of adaptation that has taken place cannot be assessed on the level of program substance, since the dominant ethic of the project seems to be one of continuous trial and experimentation. In this flux people seem to identify a basic set of activities as career education — field trips, parent visits, use of the SRA material, high school clubs, discussion groups for teachers, etc. But most people argue strongly that the career education project is more than just the sum total of these activities. They attach a great deal of importance to the existence of a staff and a collection of resources that can be used for a variety of relatively unplanned activities.

Virtually no evaluation has been done of the project, and all sources of information that are used in making decisions about program substance and administration are informal. The director undertook a small survey of parent and teacher opinion about the program, which gave overwhelmingly positive results; but he has no particular illusions about the validity or usefulness of such a device. No independent evaluation has been undertaken or is planned for the future. The director said that he had reviewed a number of evaluations of other career education projects and was generally dissatisfied with the way they were conducted. He indicated a willingness to have the project evaluated, but said that he would not contract for an evaluation until he could be assured that the effort would contribute something useful to the project.

CONTINUATION AND DISSEMINATION

The Midville project has completed its third full year of support from the state department and has plans for a fourth year of expansion and support. State program officers have not suggested that support might be terminated, and there are no plans at the district level for continuation of the program in the event outside support is withdrawn. Local administrators did mention that the state department would like all career education projects to be self-sustaining eventually, but they argued that, given the cost of the programs, such an objective is highly unrealistic. They also argued that it was to the advantage of the state to continue its support of projects like Midville's because they could be used as demonstration sites for dissemination of career education to other parts of the state.

Personnel of the Midville project seem to have been involved in a large number of dissemination activities. School-level coordinators participate in six to eight workshops per year for personnel from other school systems interested in the Midville project. The project director coordinates these activities and also uses his role as periodic instructor at a state university to draw attention to particular aspects of the project. There is no evidence, however, that any school system has attempted to duplicate the essential features of the project.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The success of the Midville project is attributable to a number of factors; some can be generalized to other settings, but others cannot.

   First, there was clearly a readiness in the system to undertake career education, indicated by the fact that the system designed an elementary-level program and secured state support for it before the USOE career education program began. This anticipation might have resulted from strongly held convictions about the importance of career education or simply from smart grantsmanship. The relatively high priority and visibility that the project assumes in the district suggests that the former interpretation is more appropriate.

   Second, the organizational structure of the project undoubtedly contributes to its success. The roles of project personnel are well defined and responsibilities are clearly delineated. Specific times are set aside for school coordinators to assist teachers. Each member of the paraprofessional central staff has designated responsibility to serve specific school coordinators. The only loosely defined part of the structure, probably by intention, is the role of the director. Virtually all routine administrative tasks are handled by the paraprofessional central staff, leaving the director free to pursue the things that interest him.

   Neither the readiness to innovate nor the organization of the project really explains its success, however. The explanation probably lies in the personality and management style of the director, as well as in the organizational environment of the school system that allows him to operate relatively free of constraints. The director conforms to few of the typical attributes that are thought to characterize a "change agent." He does not appear to be interested in creating a personal reputation that can be used to elevate his status in the Midville system, where he has always worked, or to serve as the basis for a better job in another system. He does not view himself as a temporary fixture whose sole purpose is to stimulate change and then leave the system. In spite of his firm roots in the local system, however, he does have some attributes of a cosmopolitan — professional connections outside the system and an avid intellectual interest in matters outside his immediate responsibilities. Overall, the most important feature of his management style is his easy and informal way of dealing with project personnel, teachers, school principals, and children. This style is probably the best complement to the well-defined organizational structure of the project, giving it a humane dimension that is frequently missing in a well-organized activity.

The organizational climate of the system seems to nurture and support the director. He has made something of a career of running innovative vocational programs — the land laboratory, the work experience program, and the career education project. There is a high degree of tolerance for his somewhat unorthodox ideas and opinions. And he enjoys a large amount of autonomy in the design and administration of the project. The ethic of "shared management" in the district, no doubt, plays a large role in supporting the director. But it is unlikely that shared management could work as an administrative reform in the absence of some more fundamental set of conditions, such as a relatively high level of administrative competence system-wide and a general tolerance of individual operating styles.

2. There is no prescribed formula in the Midville project that determines what career education is and is not. The project seems to thrive on the basic substantive ambiguities in the notion of career education; virtually any idea is fair game. In most instances, one suspects, this approach would not result in much tangible change. In the Midville project, however, it seems to have produced an enormous amount of activity and interest. In perhaps a dozen elementary classrooms there is documentary proof of no less than four or five distinct career education projects undertaken in a given year. Virtually all elementary and junior high classrooms in the program have, at one time or another, used the services of the in-school coordinator and the central staff. There is noticeably less activity at the high school level, but this is consistent with our findings in other school systems.

This phenomenon seems to undermine the oft-noted belief that in order for teachers to undertake innovative activity they must first be provided with some detailed recipe describing what they should do. The training activities in the Midville project intentionally avoid this approach, concentrating instead on discussions of broader issues that might serve as a source of motivation for teachers to take an interest in career education. Advice and assistance on specific activities is handled almost exclusively by school-level coordinators, and they avoid taking the position that there are "correct" or "approved" career education activities.

One result of this approach is that a good deal of the change that is attributable to the career education project goes well beyond what career education is conventionally thought to be. At the elementary level, for example, a good deal of emphasis is put on basic human relations, a subject that might be treated in any number of curriculum innovations. The career education project is viewed by all involved as a vehicle for introducing students to the general structure of relationships in society, rather than simply as a way of introducing information about occupations into the curriculum.

3. The Midville project provides no hint of a solution to the problem of continuation of innovations after external support is withdrawn. The school system continues to act on the assumption that if the project is worthwhile, it should be supported indefinitely by outside sources. Furthermore, if the state department is actually pursuing a policy of temporary support, that policy is not being communicated to local administrators in Midville. They expressed an awareness of the state's general position that projects should eventually be self-sustaining, but they did not take that position seriously enough to formulate a plan for continuation after state support is withdrawn.

EASTPLACE

Richard F. Elmore

THE SETTING AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

Eastplace, a small northeastern suburban community of about 35,000, is located 15 miles from a metropolitan city, but most of its working population is employed in local light industry and does not commute. While the town has a substantial middle-class professional and managerial population, it is predominantly a working class or lower middle-class community. Puerto Ricans and blacks each account for about 3 or 4 percent of the school enrollment. The school district has a total enrollment of about 5000 students in five elementary schools, one junior high, and one high school. A recent survey of 1971 high school graduates indicated that more than 70 percent of the respondents were enrolled in post-secondary education; this enrollment was about equally divided between two- and four-year institutions. School district personnel noted frequently that community attitudes strongly favor pursuit of a college degree after high school, rather than direct entry to the work force or vocational/technical training. Vocational programs at the high school level are moderately well-developed--including programs in business, distributive education, electronics, home economics, and industrial arts--but they are by no means the central feature of the school's program. A small number of high school students are enrolled in work experience programs and in regional training programs sponsored by a county educational agency.

The key actors in the Eastplace career education project appear to have been the assistant superintendent for federal programs and the project director. The original director recently moved to a higher position in a neighboring school system; the assistant superintendent remains. The superintendent appears only to have been involved in the project in an indirect but supportive way. The assistant superintendent is a strong personality — ambitious, highly verbal, independent, and dominating. His relationships with underlings are formal and authoritative. His relationships with superiors, including the superintendent and members of the board of education, are direct and argumentative. He makes much of his own role in the development of the project--an interesting attitude, given that most of the project's substance was developed by teachers and project staff. According to school and project personnel, the original project director shared many of the attributes of the assistant superintendent. He was a highly ambitious and authoritative manager, given to impressing his own views on subordinates rather than eliciting their views. He apparently had a coherent and clear-cut intellectual framework for the project, which he shared with the assistant superintendent. Many of those involved in the project, however, regarded his views as "too theoretical" and insufficiently grounded in experience at the classroom level. Teachers and administrators seemed generally unappreciative of, or oblivious to, the grander intellectual dimensions on which the project is based.

Neither the assistant superintendent nor the project director has roots in the community or the school system. The assistant superintendent has been in the system five years, all in his present job. The project director was in the system only during the years he ran the project. Before then, he was an employee of a private educational service firm. Both the director and the assistant superintendent have Ph. D. s and are in their mid-forties.

INITIATION

According to the assistant superintendent, the career education project came as the result of his initiative and was an outgrowth of other exemplary programs in the district. In the late 1960s the district received a substantial grant from a private foundation to develop a K-12 program in aesthetic education. The project had high visibility in the district and resulted in development of curriculum units designed to give students basic conceptual skills needed for appreciation of the arts. In 1969 the district was included in a short-lived USOE-sponsored program called Exemplary Schools for the 70s (ES-70). The specific project was to develop a mathematics program for vocational students to be disseminated to other school systems. According to the assistant superintendent, this project "fell apart" for lack of sound federal administration and support.

As a result of the ES-70 project, however, the district came to the attention of the state department's vocational specialists, and Eastplace was encouraged to apply for federal career education funds that were administered through the state. The project proposal was written by the assistant superintendent with, he claims, no technical assistance or outside support.

As a result of the aesthetic education project and the ES-70 project, as well as his doctoral dissertation on career guidance and counseling, the assistant superintendent said he began to evolve a systematic design for a career education program. "For the first time in my 20-year professional life," he said, "I began to decide what I wanted to do with the rest of my career."

The central conception of this plan was a notion he calls "process education." Process education means a variety of things, depending on which of a number of sources one consults. According to the assistant superintendent, it means "learning how to learn," or developing a basic set of conceptual skills through successive stages of growth that allows a student to learn any subject matter and make intelligent choices about his future. On a more practical level, the literature of the career education project relies heavily on individualized learning, behavioral objectives, and rigidly sequenced materials to operationalize the notion of process education.

The original proposal submitted to the state department called for a five-year project, the first three years to be spent developing career education curriculum materials and the final two years to implementing a program utilizing the materials. The state rejected the five-year plan and suggested that the district submit a three-year proposal. As a consequence, the original proposal was modified to provide for two years of curriculum development and trial and one year of implementation. This basic plan has shaped the history of the project.

IMPLEMENTATION

The term "implementation" is used rather loosely here to describe implementation of the project outlined in the proposal, rather than implementation of a career education program. In fact, attempts to implement a program on a broad scale throughout the district did not begin until the project's third year.

The project was stalled briefly at the beginning of its first year by opposition and a threatened strike from the local teachers' union. Although the issues behind this incident are murky, it appears that the teachers were not so much opposed to career education per se as they were to the administration's regular attempts to introduce instructional innovations without consulting the union. The dispute was soon ironed out and organized opposition by teachers to career education seems to have disappeared.

The curriculum development portion of the project was begun immediately. The project director and assistant superintendent constructed an elaborate and complex conceptual framework. Five stages of growth were postulated: early socializing, preadolescent, adolescent, initializing, and committing. Twenty-three "behavioral outcomes" were then specified and categorized according to stages of growth. Teachers were asked to respond to the behavioral outcomes. No substantial modifications were made as a result of consultations with teachers, but seven of the outcomes were subsumed under the other sixteen because of substantial overlap. Having established the basic set of behavioral outcomes, these were then elaborated into more than 400 content-specific behavioral objectives and more than 40 curriculum "modules." The process of curriculum development consisted of teachers organizing preexisting materials and ideas for lessons around the behavioral objectives, and producing an instructional package for each module to be used by other teachers. The modules contain statements of the general behavioral outcomes and the specific behavioral objectives to which they are addressed, statements of "criterion behaviors" which indicate successful completion of an objective, and references to curriculum materials that can be used to accomplish each objective.

Behavioral outcomes are typically stated in very general terms, for example:

- Learner identifies and describes those factors in our society which cause change, and, in turn, directly affect work, play, and people.
- Learner can locate and organize information about occupations and avocations so that sound and timely decisions can be made.
- Learner recognizes that occupational and avocational choices emerge slowly as values and readiness evolve.
- Learner demonstrates competence in evaluating risk.

Behavioral objectives and criterion behaviors are typically stated in somewhat more precise terms, for example:

- The learner will describe the ways in which machines have replaced work animals.
- The learner will be able to list five decisions he has made in any one day.

The volume and complexity of materials flowing from this conceptual framework are, as one might expect, staggering. One document that simply lists behavioral outcomes, objectives, and criterion behaviors is more than 90 pages long. Each of the more than 40 modules runs from 50 to 80 pages. As if this weren't enough, after the modules were completed, another series of documents was developed relating the modules and behavioral objectives to established curricula in social studies, home economics, science, and English. These documents average about 30 to 40 pages.

The materials are all teacher-developed, and a substantial proportion — but by no means all — have been piloted in the classrooms of the teachers who developed them. A plan to implement the modules in other classrooms in the district was begun in the fall of the project's third year. A "transfer agent" was designated in each school, with responsibility for assisting teachers in that school in the utilization of the modules. During the second and third years of the project, workshops were held for a small fraction of teachers in the district to discuss the modules and anticipate problems in using them. Administrators concluded on the basis of these workshops that "readiness to utilize career education units varies inversely with grade level" and that "extensive support is necessary for teachers who are trying to use the units." In addition, a faculty meeting was held early in the year in each school to introduce faculty to the modules and the teachers in the school who had worked on their development.

Use of modules after one year of implementation activity appears not to be widespread. Administrators claim that a goal of 33 percent of students being exposed to the modules and 50 percent teacher participation was met, but it is difficult to find evidence of this. In all of the schools visited it was impossible to find a single teacher who used the modules routinely, and it was possible to find only very few who had tried one or more of them. Most of the teachers interviewed said they were familiar with the modules but had not found time to use them. In one elementary school, administrators claimed that the participation rate was 100 percent. This school showed by far the highest level of commitment to career education, and a number of interesting activities were going on; but only a handful of teachers had used the modules. The typical activity in this school — an active and successful school store, baking, learning games, preparation and assembly of animal skeletons — was, in fact, not distinguished by its conformity to any overall plan, but rather by its inventiveness and spontaneity. Those teachers who seemed vitally interested in career education said they had gotten some interesting ideas from some of the modules, but preferred to develop their own projects. The most interesting and "innovative" classrooms in the schools visited seemed to have developed their own individual style of instruction and classroom organization, and career education was regarded as a worthwhile but marginal activity. Neither the modules nor the intellectual framework behind them seem to have had much impact on individual classrooms.

On the other hand, virtually all administrators and teachers supported career education in principle. An occasional teacher would express deep skepticism about the notion, but these were a small minority. The typical response of school principals was best expressed by the junior high principal, who said the basic idea behind the career education project was sound; it was the first example he had seen where a new curriculum idea began with a coherent theoretical position and sufficient time was spent developing that position prior to implementation. He was also very supportive of the idea of teacher-developed materials. He added, however, that implementation would be a difficult, long-term task requiring a high level of commitment from the district's central administration. If that support were to be weakened or withdrawn, implementation would cease immediately, he argued. He said there was good reason to believe that the central administration was intellectually and emotionally committed to career education, but there was some reason to doubt whether they were financially committed.

Another interesting problem of implementation was raised by several teachers. They argued that in the past year or so they had felt increasing pressure from the central administration and from certain elements of the community for a narrowly defined kind of accountability. They had been made to feel that their first responsibility was to improve reading scores. Classroom activities designed to meet this goal were given first priority. Then, they said, they were confronted with statements by administrators that implementation of career education was the district's first priority. They felt a strong and uncomfortable conflict between accountability and career education, arguing that time spent on career education was time that was probably more productively spent on reading. In the final analysis, they clearly felt that they had more at stake personally in improving reading scores than in implementing a career education.

MAINTENANCE AND ADAPTATION

To talk about maintenance and adaptation in this case is premature because the project is just in the first phase of implementation. The organizational structure of the project is clearly designed to support maintenance, but whether it will or not is a question for the future. The project's central office is composed of the newly appointed director and one other professional staff member, a former classroom teacher, highly regarded by other teachers in the system, who has been with the project since its inception. The central staff deals with teachers through the designated transfer agent in each school. Transfer agents are, by and large, not regular classroom teachers, but special teachers or counselors who have sufficient flexibility in their schedules to allocate some portion of their time to career education. Commitment and interest among transfer agents seem to vary widely, from a high level of enthusiasm to a somewhat casual indifference. There was little evidence of a well-developed, routine relationship between transfer agents and teachers within schools. Having only functioned in their role for one school year, it is unrealistic to expect transfer agents to have become very powerful actors within schools.

Adaptation in the earliest stages of implementation is evident in several cases. The modules, as they were conceived by the original director and assembled by teachers, constitute a formidable and enormously complicated program. The tight and systematic rhetoric of behavioral objectives gives the illusion of a comprehensive system that must be either totally adopted or not adopted at all. The project administration has reinforced this illusion by saying that eventually each individual student's progress through the modules will be monitored by computer. That is, a computer system will be developed that will store a complete record of each student's performance on every objective.

On the other hand, the project administration has sensed teacher resistance to such a tightly structured program. The results of an early teacher workshop are summarized in part by the following statement:

> There is no unique way in which career units should be taught or presented to students. Teacher needs, the school organization, and the requirements of particular students make all interaction dependent on the situation rather than on a simple formula.

Faced with the imposing structure and complexity of the modules, teachers and administrators have begun to invent devices and rationalizations for using them piecemeal. A frequently heard remark was that the modules were never intended to be used sequentially or in any systematic way — a puzzling statement in light of the fact that each module is specifically designed for a given stage of development, and the objectives seem to follow the logic of sequential stages.

Typically, the teachers who had used the modules had either chosen one part that interested them and designed a series of lessons around it or had simply used an idea from the modules as a point of departure for some activity. In no case had a teacher attempted to work sequentially through more than one module. This suggests that eventually the modules will probably be used simply as source materials by those teachers interested in career education, and not as the basis for a comprehensive system of sequential career development. It also suggests a certain discontinuity between the rigor of a system of behavioral objectives and the way that classroom teachers typically view the process of education. The grander theoretical pretensions of the module system do not seem very important to the teachers except insofar as they occasionally provide grounds for criticizing the central staff of the project for being insufficiently sensitive to the needs of teachers.

While no evaluation has yet been undertaken, the project staff has given some attention to the development of an evaluation plan. To establish some source of baseline data for later evaluations, the Crites Vocational Development Inventory was given to virtually all of the more than 2000 students in the system in grades 7 through 12 in November 1972.

A plan is also under way to secure teacher evaluations of the modules; teachers will be asked to rate a given module according to how well they feel it accomplishes its objectives. The present director attaches relatively high priority to the development of an evaluation plan and has initiated contact with some outside groups who have experience designing evaluations of career education programs.

CONTINUATION AND DISSEMINATION

During the 1973-74 school year, the system applied to the state department for a renewal of its grant, citing its original plan for five years of external support. The proposal was made jointly with a county education agency and included extensive provision for dissemination of the project to other systems in the county. Administrators were generally pessimistic about the prospects of continuing the project at its previous level in the event that state support was not forthcoming. The local system can only provide support for one of the two professionals on the project's central staff, and a loss of state support would mean a curtailment of future module development, training, and evaluation activities. Central administrators and school board members generally indicated a high level of support for career education and for the work of the project staff, but gave no indication of any serious long-range planning for continuation of the project after state funding was terminated. In their remarks about continuation they echoed a familiar theme: shrinking enrollments and increasingly uncertain financial circumstances make it difficult to commit funds to the continuation of exemplary programs, no matter how much the school system would like to.

During the third year of the project one workshop was held with the primary purpose of dissemination. County school districts were invited to send teachers to participate in general sessions on career education, equality of employment opportunity, value clarification, and use of the modules. Thirty-five people attended this workshop. In addition, visits were made to the project by representatives of a number of other neighboring school systems. As noted earlier, the primary purpose of the continuation grant requested from the state is to work with the county agency to disseminate the project throughout the county.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The Eastplace project represents a pattern of development that might hold some promise for other exemplary projects. Two-thirds of the original three-year grant was devoted to activities that can best be characterized as program development, rather than implementation. Only after a substantial amount of effort had been devoted to creating teacher-developed materials was any attempt made at implementation. This pattern seems to have a high degree of support among teachers and principals in the system, and they regard it as a promising departure from the usual confusing pattern of conducting program development and implementation simultaneously.
2. On the level of program substance, there are a number of interesting and instructive points in the Eastplace case. The original conception of the project, developed by the first director and the assistant superintendent, seems to have remained intact throughout the developmental stage. The complex system of behavioral objectives was elaborated into an enormous quantity of highly structured material. The teachers who developed the material apparently found the conceptual scheme useful in organizing their work. However, in the early stages of implementation there are signs that the system is being rather freely adapted. Those teachers who use the modules seem to choose specific parts that suit their own purposes or to use ideas from them as a point of departure for activities. The project administration takes an ambivalent posture toward this adaptation. On the one hand they foresee development of a computer-based system for monitoring each child's progress through the modules; on the other hand they argue that there is no approved system for using the modules. Over the long run, one suspects, the modules will be used simply as resource materials.
3. After one year of implementation activity, the level of implementation appears to be rather low, considerably lower than that claimed by the

project administration. Most teachers and principals are aware of the project and the modules and have positive attitudes toward career education. But career education has not become an established part of the school program. Where there is greatest evidence of the use of career materials, they are a relatively minor adjunct to other innovative activities conducted in individual classrooms. Career education is by no means the major vehicle for curriculum innovation in the district. It seems to serve as a useful resource for teachers who are already inclined to be adventuresome in the way they structure classroom activities.

4. Eastplace provides no solution to the problem of continuation. The system has devised a plan for joint funding from the state with the grouping of county school districts that provides for further development of the project and dissemination to other systems in the county. But they have developed no long-range plans for continuing the project in the event state support is terminated. As in other systems, they argue that financial uncertainties make it impossible to develop such a plan.

BIKSON COUNTY

Richard F. Elmore

THE SETTING AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

Bikson County is composed of urban and suburban Esprey, and a few outlying rural communities, one of which is Victor, where the career education project was located. The county as a whole, like the "New South" within which it lies, has a well-developed economic base: a substantial amount of light industry, an enormous amount of commercial development, and a proximity to a collection of research and technical facilities. The population of the county is about 150,000; the school system serves about 31,000 students. The per-pupil expenditure of the school system (1973-74) is about $900.

Victor is located in a part of the county that is just beginning to see the economic development that is so prominent in the rest of the county. A survey taken in the Victor area just before the career education project began indicated that better than half the families had an income of less than $5000 per year, 83 percent of the heads of households had not graduated from high school, and over a third of the housing was substandard. Blacks constitute about a third of the total population of the area and about half of the school enrollment. School people in Victor estimate that about 20 percent of high school graduates go on to some kind of post-secondary education, as compared with about 50 percent in the county as a whole.

The Bikson County school administration is exclusively composed of "locals," most of whom were educated in the system themselves and have come to their positions by working their way up through it. A number of people outside the system referred to the existence of an "old boy network" that determined access to administrative jobs. A typical statement was, "So-and-so is a hunting companion of so-and-so. That's probably how he got his job." The present superintendent, who has been in the system for more than 20 years, holds a master's degree from the local teacher's college. Personnel of the career education project all have similar backgrounds.

The county appears to have a well-developed vocational program. Each high school has a work experience program in addition to the usual array of home economics and vocational courses. Each junior high has an industrial arts program, and some have exploratory vocational and occupational guidance courses. The high school programs antedate the federally sponsored career education project. The junior high exploratory and guidance programs were introduced at about the same time as the Federal Project, but school personnel make no connection between the start of the programs and the project.

The Federal Project was one of those funded directly by USOE, rather than through the state department. The project began in the fall of 1970 and ended in the spring of 1973, when federal funds were withdrawn, as per schedule. Personnel who were involved in project administration have taken other jobs in the school system, and only one of them remains in the Victor area. The associate director of the project returned to his previous job in a high school in another part of the county. Another staff member remained as a counselor in Victor High. The two remaining staff teach in a junior high in suburban Esprey.

INITIATION

The Bikson County career education project was conceived and initially developed entirely outside the county school system -- perhaps the most important aspect of the case. The project proposal was written and submitted by state university staff at the Career Center in Esprey. The center had long been interested in a special program for the Victor area because it was the most economically depressed and isolated part of the county. In the summer of 1969, before desegregation of the area's high schools, the center sponsored a planning conference composed of student representatives and guidance counselors from the black and white high schools in Victor. The purpose of the conference was to suggest ways that vocational guidance could be improved. The center intended to seek outside funding for a special guidance project. When the announcement of the federal career education program was made in late fall of 1969, the center saw its opportunity. During Christmas vacation a proposal was hurriedly prepared and taken to the Bikson County school administration for approval.

The original idea of developing a vocational guidance program for high school students was abandoned in favor of a comprehensive career education program. The center staff relied heavily on Grant Venn's program memorandum and some excerpts from the report of the House Committee for clues as to what a career education project should be. When the proposal was fully written it was taken to the Bikson County school administration for perfunctory approval--an odd happenstance, since the project was to be administered entirely by the school system. The school administration readily agreed to the proposal; it was submitted and later funded.

School officials frankly admitted that they had nothing to do with the development of the proposal, and at one point said that they didn't get around to reading the document until six months into the project. In retrospect, all parties agree that it was a mistake for the proposal to have been conceived entirely outside the system. The school administrators argued that they didn't really begin to think about career education until well into the first year of the project. The center staff acknowledged that it would have been good to involve the school administration, but they argued that the school people weren't interested in working on the proposal. The problem was compounded enormously by the fact that the center was later chosen by USOE to serve as the independent evaluator of the project. The center staff, in retrospect, feel there was a definite conflict of interest in this role, but they were apparently not concerned about it at the time. The school administration felt that the evaluation contract gave the center a license to second-guess their conduct of the program; as the project developed, they became increasingly dissatisfied with the role of the evaluators.

The main preoccupation of the center staff in the development of the proposal was research and evaluation. They wanted a project design that would allow rigorous evaluation. They specified detailed "product" (outcome) and "process" (program implementation) objectives, for example:

- Increase by 5 per year the number of occupations that students (grades 1-5) can list.
- Increase by 10 percent per year the percentage of students applying for post-secondary education.
- Increase by [unspecified] percentiles per year the average achievement of students (grades 1-12) as measured by the California Test of Basic Skills.
- Discussion of habits and attitudes for employability.
- Investigation of student characteristics.
- Utilization of intense placement-counseling services.

The school administration, on the other hand, regarded the concerns of the center staff as "too theoretical." They saw research and evaluation as purely secondary, a peripheral matter best taken care of by "asking the kids what they were getting out of the program."

The proposal outlined a detailed organizational and substantive scheme for the Victor program. The formal title of project director was assigned to the assistant superintendent for vocational education. One-quarter of his salary was to be paid from project funds, and his major responsibilities were to make all policy decisions, control the expenditure of funds, coordinate the activities of the project with other vocational programs, and ensure that program objectives were being met. The associate director was assigned full-time to the project. He was to assume the major responsibilities for project administration, including community involvement, in-service training, and cataloging and reporting project activities. School-level personnel were all assigned full-time to the project. The elementary occupational information specialist was to serve as a consultant and resource person to teachers for the purpose of integrating career materials into the curriculum. The middle grades counselor-coordinator was to construct and administer an Occupations Center that would provide career counseling for students, coordinate field trips, and provide curriculum resources for teachers. At the high school level there were two full-time project personnel. The high school counselor-coordinator was to provide career counseling for students and serve as a placement officer for students entering employment directly from school. The general occupational education coordinator was to construct training programs that would provide entry-level skills for high school students.

There was one additional feature of project organizations that was to become quite important as the project developed. School-level personnel did not report directly to the associate director. Their first responsibility was to their building principal, who in turn was to report to the associate director.

IMPLEMENTATION

The project was late getting started because the proposal was not approved until the final weeks before the beginning of the 1970-71 school year. Staff assignments were not made until after the school year had begun. Hence there was no pre-service training for teachers, and the details of the program had to be worked out while it was being implemented. Those involved in the project unanimously agreed that the first year was primarily developmental, with very little actual implementation taking place.

The implementation strategy consisted exclusively of in-service workshops in which the structure of the project was explained and material having to do with career education was introduced. Attendance at these workshops was voluntary, but according to project personnel about 90 percent of the teachers attended at one time or another. This was probably due largely to the fact that teachers were paid for their attendance and received graduate credit.

The basic organizational structure outlined in the proposal was maintained throughout the first year. During the summer following the first year, curriculum development workshops were held and curriculum guides were written containing detailed lesson plans for integrating career materials into elementary and secondary school programs. These guides were subsequently used for in-service training, but there is no real evidence to indicate their effect.

MAINTENANCE AND ADAPTATION

If project personnel were unanimous about the developmental character of the first year of the program, they were similarly unanimous in the opinion that the project's second year was its best. According to school-level coordinators, enthusiasm was high and teachers began to take career education seriously. In-service training was continued, and the elementary and junior high coordinators felt that a significant proportion of the teachers were attempting to introduce career materials into the regular curriculum.

At the elementary level a small adaptation of the original project was introduced: a course in small tool handling. The elementary coordinator indicated that he was initially enthusiastic about the course, but as the year progressed his opinion changed. Teachers began to identify the course as the school's career education program, he said, making it more difficult to persuade them that they had a responsibility to integrate career materials into their own classes.

At the junior high level, the coordinator said that she began to develop a more direct and confident style of dealing with teachers and a more systematic way of handling her counseling responsibilities. Some additional exploratory vocational courses were introduced by adapting the original junior high program. These courses aimed to provide some "hands-on" experience for junior high students prior to their entry into high school vocational programs.

At the high school level, the counselor began to develop a strategy of individual and small-group career counseling. The occupational education coordinator began an intensive, and apparently quite successful, program of training for entry-level skills. Evaluators claim that the program was successful in placing 100 percent of its students. According to evaluators and project personnel, the coordinator was an outspoken critic of the county school administration. He was assigned to another school after the second year of the project and was replaced by an employee of the central administrative office who spent virtually no time in the school.

A major intervening event during the implementation of the program was the racial integration of the Victor schools. The final phase of a county-wide desegregation plan took place in the first year of the program, changing the previous dual school system in Victor into an integrated system. The staff of the career education project felt that desegregation had little effect on the implementation of the programs. The high school counselor, however, ventured the opinion that desegregation may have enhanced the success of the project's second year, because "we were all determined to do anything we could to prove that integration could work." She also said that some Victor High students who were transferred out of the school after the first year of the project requested permission to return in the second year because of the career education project there.

The project's third and final year was characterized by an erosion of the gains made in the second year. All project personnel noted a substantial change in attitude toward the project. The junior high coordinator characterized this view when she observed that she began to lose her foothold with teachers when they recognized that she probably would not be in the school beyond the third year. Morale of the project staff began to deteriorate. Teachers and principals began to express openly cynical views about the here-today-and-gone-tomorrow nature of the program. No time was given in the final weeks of the school year to devising ways of maintaining the program in Victor schools.

When project personnel were asked to assess major problems of implementation and maintenance, their views coalesced around two major themes. The first was a common one in all the career education projects visited--the difficulty of getting nonvocational teachers, particularly at the high school level, to integrate career materials into their classes. All agreed that there were some teachers who could probably never be reached, but that given time and continued support it should be possible to reach most teachers. The second implementation problem was more specific to the organizational structure of the Victor project. School-level coordinators were responsible to their building principals, and not directly to the central administration. This apparently led to a number of instances in which project personnel were taken away from career education activities and given other tasks by the building principals.

The evaluators of the project from the Career Center at the university had very strong opinions about the administration and the effectiveness of the program. They felt that project personnel at the school level were dedicated and competent, but that the project director and associate director failed miserably in their administration of the program. Most of the administrators' time, they argued, was spent on activities having nothing to do with the project and, as a consequence, coordination, community support, and plans for continuation of the project never materialized. On several occasions, the evaluators said, they brought these deficiencies in project administration to the attention of program staff at USOE. They claimed that federal program officers never followed through on these reports and, in fact, asked them to make their evaluation reports "more general," deleting material about administration.

The Career Center produced two interim reports and one final report on the effectiveness of the Victor program. They followed through with their original detailed evaluation plan, even though they grew increasingly skeptical about its appropriateness in the face of the administrative difficulties they observed. Of the twenty original Program Product Objectives they had specified, eight were not attained (e.g., increase student performance in academic subjects, increase student interest in post-secondary training, increase by 5 per year the number of occupations that students can list, increase by 10 percent per year the percentage of students applying for post-secondary education). The remaining 12 were either partially attained (i.e., attained at one grade level and not another) or completely attained (e.g., increase student interest in post-secondary training, increase by 5 per year the number of "good" work habits each student can list, increase by 10 percent per year the percentage of students participating in work experience programs). Commenting on the results of their evaluation, one of the evaluators said, "If you read between the lines, you'll discover that not much really happened."

CONTINUATION AND DISSEMINATION

The county school administration made three attempts to secure financial support for the career education project after termination of federal funding. They succeeded in getting school board approval for a plan to continue the Victor project and disseminate it throughout the county. When the proposal went before the board of county commissioners for funding, however, it was rejected. School officials said that the county commissioners' rejection of the project was not based on any disapproval of the notion of career education, but rather on a lack of funds. Successive attempts to secure state and federal funding for the project also failed.

Asked if they could point to any activities presently going on in the school system that were attributable to the career education project, administrators and former project personnel could give no readily observable examples. They argued that it was unreasonable to expect to find instances of career education in schools where there was no one with full-time responsibility for implementing the notion.

One evaluator criticized the federal government for giving insufficient attention to the issue of continuation. He argued that all projects are funded at a level that cannot conceivably be supported after federal funds are withdrawn; federal program officers do not even attempt to establish what proportion a given project grant is of the school system's total operating budget. Even the most superficial analysis of local school finance, he said, would indicate that systems probably cannot assume even a small fraction of the cost of programs after federal funds terminate.

County school administrators were also critical of project funding. They argued that the three-year project grant format gives the federal government a very bad name at the local level, because it creates a "here-today-and-gone-tomorrow" attitude among teachers and principals who are asked to undertake an innovation. Too much money is dumped initially on school systems, they said, and support does not last long enough to guarantee that programs will stick. In their alternative proposal, funding would begin at a relatively low level, increase to a maximum over a three-year period, and taper off for two or three years. This, they argued, would permit systems to build up a program gradually and then find alternative sources of support as the funds taper off.

The major focus of dissemination efforts in the Bikson County project was geared toward putting career education programs in other schools in the county, rather than disseminating them outside the county or the state. These efforts were relatively modest, however. Some teachers from outside the Victor attendance area were included in workshops during the operation of the program. In the spring of the final year, a workshop was held by Victor personnel for other teachers in the county. There is no tangible evidence that these efforts had any effect.

During the operation of the project, the associate director prepared materials and a slide-tape presentation describing the program to outside visitors. A number of people visited the project, but here again there is no evidence that these visits resulted in any attempt to replicate the Victor program.

CONCLUSIONS

1. All parties agreed that a high price was paid for the way the project was initiated. School administrators felt no particular attachment to the proposal because they had no role in writing it. Evaluators felt that the administrators were insufficiently aware of the project objectives outlined in the proposal. Overall, the character of the initiation process resulted in a slow beginning for the project and a generally difficult relationship between evaluators and administrators during the operation of the project.
2. A combination of the slow beginning of the project and the three-year term of the grant meant that there was only one year of significant implementation. All agreed that to expect substantial results within the three-year term of the grant was extremely unrealistic.
3. There is no evidence of continuation or dissemination of the project. Administrators did make attempts to secure financial support for continuation, but when these failed they had no devices for keeping the program alive even in a very limited form. Attempts to disseminate the program within and outside the county did not produce tangible results. Administrators and evaluators made a credible case that the federal program officers should bear a substantial part of the responsibility for the failure to continue the program, because they apparently had never thought through the issue of continuation in any systematic way.

LAKEWOOD

Anthony H. Pascal

Lakewood,was chosen as a fieldwork site for a number of reasons. It has both federally administered and state-administered projects. It is a very large city with a sizable minority population. It was also the site of Title III and Right-To-Read projects.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL DISTRICT

Lakewood is one of the largest cities in the United States. It is heavily industrialized, and the population is more than a third black. The white population is largely ethnic, with a heavy representation of people with Italian and East European backgrounds. Whites and blacks generally do not share the same neighborhoods nor, therefore, the same schools.

Vocational education has long been stressed in the Lakewood public schools. Currently about 45 percent of the high school graduates are vocational majors. The superintendent claims that he was responsible for a major reallocation of the state's vocational education funds from the rural districts, where they had been concentrated, toward the larger urban areas such as Lakewood. Still, the district maintains that it spends $5 of locally raised funds on vocational education for every $1 it receives in vocational education grants from the state or federal governments. Recently, special vocational counselors have been appointed for the noncollege-bound, and the folklore figure around the district is that they place 97 percent of their student-clients (however, about an equal number of students, it was learned, are not clients of the counselors and leave school with no further education plans). About 35 percent of the high school graduates in Lakewood go on to some form of post-secondary education.

The superintendent, when queried, showed little reluctance in expressing his skepticism about the value of the career education projects in the Lakewood schools. He felt that the funds would have been better spent had they been applied directly to occupational instruction so that graduates and even dropouts might leave high school with an economically valuable skill. The significance of making elementary students more familiar with the "world of work" or encouraging secondary students to "explore career alternatives" seems to have eluded him, or at least was not a high-priority undertaking in his eyes.

The Lakewood system, even more than most of the big city local education agencies (LEAs) we have encountered in the course of this study, seems somewhat rigid, cumbersome, and stultified. The superintendent stressed concepts such as "delivering the freight," "keeping the ship afloat," and so forth. He seemed to display an inordinate interest in the smooth functioning of the bureaucracy, stating at one point that an almost subversive flanking action was necessary to engineer any kind of significant change in the schools. These cautious, "don't rock the boat" attitudes were reflected in the system as a whole, as might be expected. All the way down the line, at the central headquarters, in principals' offices, and in the classroom, there appeared an extreme consciousness of precedent, of the views of superiors, of the perquisites of seniority, and a general absence of interest in experimentation. One characteristic of school people here was a strong reluctance to take initiative. Among higher ups this appeared to be a fear of stepping out of line; among classroom teachers it seemed to stem from a disinclination to take on extra tasks.

INITIATION

It is hard to discover just who the originator of the project was. Early in the planning of first-round projects, then HEW Secretary Finch, on the urging of Senator Mondale and other Senators, stipulated that 20 of the 50 Commissioner's projects would be awarded to districts with Model Cities agencies and utilized in the disadvantaged neighborhoods served by these agencies. This is how Lakewood got its grant. In 1970 the board of education was approached by a delegation from Model Cities based in one of Lakewood's most poverty stricken neighborhoods. The delegates listed the following problems, which they claimed would be alleviated by the establishment of a career education project in the Madison High School attendance area:

- Poor relations between area residents and the board of education.
- Poor quality of vocational counseling in the schools.
- Unsatisfactory state of vocational training.
- Absence of any training for entrepreneurship and small business proprietorship.

(It is interesting to note that only the allusion to counseling hit a central theme of the career education philosophy. In other words, the neighborhood group wanted some kind of vocational education project; the availability of career education grant funds was merely a convenient happenstance.) The Model Cities people were also insistent that the head of the Department of Technical and Industrial Education at Madison High be appointed director of the project.

The board of education was anxious to accommodate the Model Cities group and assigned the district's star proposal writer to design a plan that would meet the (rather loose) specifications imposed by the Program Development and Operations Branch in BAVTE, USOE on the Model Cities-initiated project. A cynical view might hold that this was a fairly small investment for the district to make to get an important advocacy group off its back. After all, the Part D money would not come to the district in any other way. So, except for the proposal writer's time, the grant to the Madison High School complex had no real cost to the board of education. It could be argued, even more cynically, that the quality of interest and back-up expressed by the board in this project was correspondingly low.

Lakewood did not seem to use assistance from outside except, of course, for the proposal guidance materials sent out by USOE. Lakewood also was probably one of the few districts we visited that did not claim that it had invented the idea of career education long before it became a priority program in USOE. The district feels that federal guidance in preparation of the project, and for that matter, in its conduct, has been minimal. Help from the state, other than a grant to be described, has, on the other hand, been nonexistent.

Career education was not a cherished and long-held goal of the district, but a target of opportunity. It has since become, however, as we describe below, a staple of the system.

One does not get the feeling that people at the school level were expected to participate in any significant way in the planning of the Federal Project. Complaints were voiced at both the junior high and the elementary schools on this score. At the high schools there was more early involvement, of at least the department heads, if not by all the participating teachers, but these sessions were devoted more to instructing school personnel as to the nature of the project than to eliciting their help in structuring it. We believe that this turned out to be a major defect.

The Model Cities people imposed their ideas of localism beyond the naming of the director. All aides and specialists hired for the project were not only required to live in the Model Cities area but must have attended schools there. These are two alternative interpretations of this regulation: (1) that it ensured that project staff would be familiar and have empathy with the local scene or (2) that the rather attractive staff jobs would go to friends of the Model Cities Agency.

Funds did not reach Lakewood before November 1970. Detailed logistic and administrative planning did not begin until then. Thus, it was the summer of 1971 before in-service training for teachers could begin. The project, in the school year 1971-72, was restricted to elementary schools only. There were in-service sessions, which appeared to be very brief and not very well organized. Aides selected by the Model Cities people were assigned to each school on a full-time basis, and there were coordinating teachers assigned to clusters of schools. None of these people had vocational educational experience, and so they had to be brought up to date as well. The aide's function was to help teachers write curriculum materials that incorporated career education concepts into language arts, social studies, math, science, etc., to arrange for field visits and resource speakers applicable to career exploration and occupational awareness themes, and to facilitate the gathering and use of supplementary materials on career education for classroom and library use. The coordinating teacher's function was to guide staff development and oversee curriculum revision.

When the program moved into the secondary schools in the summer of 1972, it had only one year left to run. Yet the same approach was followed, at least theoretically. Some teachers attended statewide conferences on career education, department heads attended in-service sessions for which they were paid, and aides and coordinators were assigned to the schools. To the best of our understanding, however, the junior high component actually consisted in the provision of a work experience teacher slot; the only career education that took place occurred in the work experience classrooms. Here, career concepts were taught, field trips taken, and resource people visited. There seemed to be little attempt to convince the mainline junior high classroom teachers to reform the presentation of their material.

At the high school level, reform attempts were made and a full-time aide was assigned. Catalogues of career material were distributed among teachers. The principal encouraged the adoption of career concepts into the curriculum, working through the department heads.

The project, when initiated, did not seem to have aroused any strong opposition; indifference seems to have been the more common reaction. The Model Cities people and their allies pushed hard, but their objectives were not very close to those laid down by the career education proponents at USOE. Everyone agrees that local business enterprises and public employees cooperated effectively in hosting field trips and sending resource speakers. The top vocational education officials at the board of education made much of the effectiveness of the citizens' advisory committee that was set up to help guide and facilitate the project. Yet in dealing with project directors, principals, and others, we were unable to uncover any specific accomplishments by this group.

IMPLEMENTATION

The program elements the Lakewood people say they attempted to install were the standard career education package:

- Career awareness in elementary schools.
- Career exploration in the junior high schools.
- Career preparation and counseling in the high schools.

The mechanisms they proposed using were again the standard ones:

- New lesson plans incorporating career materials into traditional curricula.
- Hands-on projects.
- Field visits to sites of potential employment.
- Audio-visual and printed materials to foster career exploration.
- Resource speakers who would acquaint students with the characteristics of various careers and the requirements to prepare for them.

Both the package and the methods were applied quite unevenly. Materials were difficult to acquire during the course of the project, and teachers were not given the opportunity to preview materials they might have liked to order. The gasoline shortage curtailed the use of field trips. Not nearly so many outside speakers as teachers would have liked made appearances. The aides assigned to the schools tended, in the case of the elementary schools, to come in a couple of times a week to deliver lectures and did not serve as general-purpose aides. In the high school the aide was simply not to be found a good portion of the time.

The Madison High complex (i.e., Madison and all of its feeder schools) was chosen because it is located in the Model Cities neighborhood. It includes the worst slum areas in Lakewood. It is perfectly obvious that this situation did not improve the likelihood of project success. Disciplinary problems, student and staff alienation, distrust of outsiders, fatalism with respect to the outcomes of programs--all abound in neighborhoods like the one in which this project was placed. The program could hardly have had a more severe test or one more likely to have failed.

The project ostensibly depended on the voluntary participation by teachers, which should have meant that only the most motivated were involved. (In the elementary school, participation seemed to be more a matter of engaging an entire grade during, say, the social studies session.) Nevertheless, it is probably seldom the case that participation by teachers in these sorts of projects is truly voluntary; subtle pressure is exerted by principals and other administrators to ensure compliance with what appears to them to be the desires of their own superiors. All of the teachers interviewed complained about a lack of contact with teachers from other schools, who were also engaged in career education, and about the remoteness of the coordinating teachers and the project director. The idea of using department heads and lead teachers as liaison with project leadership appears not to have worked very well.

Teachers at all levels complained that they simply did not have time to make all of the lesson plan changes that would be required. This statement applied more to, but was not restricted to, upper-level teachers. Age of teacher did not seem to be an important variable. When asked what they really needed, the answer, only somewhat exaggerated, would have been something like this: "We need an entire revision in the curriculum, delivered to us intact, which would require no extra time to learn to use, and which would preserve all of the academic dignity my subject contains."

Adaptation during the course of the program, which was only one year in the high school and consisted merely of adding a work experience teacher in the junior high (and it appears that work experience in the junior high is seen as a good way to get rid of the most obstreperous students for at least half of the day), was mostly a process of scaling down expectations and of shaking out bugs. These bugs were in such areas as procedures for reviewing and ordering materials, and making arrangements for trips and speakers.

The Federal Project in Lakewood, contrary to most of the other programs we visited, accorded little attention and effort to the production of materials and plans. The more usual practice was to place orders for packaged, off-the-shelf materials in basic or supplementary curriculum. In most other LEAs, the project staff showed a disinclination to use materials prepared elsewhere for other situations. It appeared to us a commendable if somewhat inefficient attitude. This sort of zeal was not evident to us in Lakewood.

MAINTENANCE

The period of the Federal Project was so short that the concept of a maintenance period makes little sense. Certainly, pressure from downtown to "keep up the good work" was not persistent; in fact, it never really existed, even at the start. The program content did not really change; it merely faded away as the end of the funding period drew near. In fact, it has been claimed that for the last half year of the project the aides and specialists were hardly ever around--they were out looking for new jobs.

The major changes that occurred in the course of the project were a deemphasis of attempts at curriculum revision and a consequent relative, though perhaps not absolute, increase in the use of such devices as trips, speakers, and packaged materials. One problem in this sustaining phase turned out to be the long turnaround time required to obtain career education materials that participating teachers ordered. The reason offered was the inability of the project staff to prevent teachers at schools outside the experimental complex from ordering the materials, thus making them unavailable and clogging the bookkeeping system with unmet demands.

As to evaluation, a third-party study, as required by regulation, was performed. The evaluation was badly done from a number of aspects. For example:

1. No before and after tests were administered.
2. The control group was selected by the program personnel, not by the evaluators.
3. No ability measures were given for the control group.
4. Project teachers administered tests to the treatment group; evaluators administered tests to the control group.

The evaluators concluded that there were positive gains in career knowledge over the course of the project, but this conclusion is highly suspect given the points above. On affective domains (e.g., ranking of career preferences) there did seem to be differences between treatments and controls, but the patterns were unstable over time and counter-intuitive. The evaluators stated their findings in appropriately moderate language; the school officials insisted on interpreting the report as a hosanna to project effectiveness. There is no evidence that evaluation findings were ever fed back into the reform of the Federal Project or into the design of the State Project (see below).

CONTINUATION/DISSEMINATION

The most interesting aspect of the Federal Project in Lakewood is probably that for all its weaknesses it succeeded in spawning what appears to be a quite successful career education project in a school complex which the Madison High School neighborhood abuts. In the Burkshire High School attendance area, vocational education funds from the State Department of Education (comprised of the state's share of Part D and of Part C grants) support what is called the State Project. The aims and methods are quite similar to what was initially proposed in the Federal Project and in all of the standard career education schemes around the country. The difference seems to be that the State Project works significantly better. It is difficult to say whether this is because it profited from the mistakes of the Federal Project, because it simply took time for the concept to mature, because Burkshire and its feeder schools are not so disadvantaged as their Madison complex neighbors, or because the State Project is an integral part of Lakewood board of education operations, unlike the Federal Project.

There were obvious lessons learned from the Federal Project. Most of these have been digested and have improved the conduct of the State Project. Ordering of materials is a smooth and almost trouble-free procedure now. Most of the Burkshire complex schools have well-displayed and complete career information resource centers. Much elementary school activity is in hands-on projects--for example, building and operating a mock store or a restaurant or putting out a newspaper, with emphasis on the nature of cooperation among the various occupational specialties and with attention to the relevance of various subject matters in performing a specialty. There is also evidence that teachers employ career-connected themes in delivering conventional instruction.

On the other hand, the State Project made less use of field trips and resource speakers than the Federal Project allegedly did. Whether the claims for the Federal Project are valid is impossible to verify at this time.

The morale of the teachers, counselors, and librarians seemed much superior to that encountered in the Federal Project. They were involved early and seem to feel much more like partners in the project than like the passive or even resistant participants in the Federal Project. There are no aides and specialists "from the community" to complicate things. Teachers, thus, do not feel resentful over what many people in the Federal Project implied was a free ride accorded to such outsiders. The specialists involved in the State Project, all part-time, tend to be librarians and counselors, and they seem to interact with teachers and principals much more effectively than the Model Cities people, who were seen as interlopers and recognized to be temporary.

It should be noted that the State Project is considered a permanent part of the curriculum in the Burkshire complex schools. As long as the state continues to subsidize vocational education in local schools, career education is expected to continue in this area. We were told that it will be extended to other parts of the Lakewood system, but the timetable is uncertain. It is highly likely that the feeling of permanence has been influential in explaining the relative success of the State Project where it has been tried.

There still is not much visible progress at the high school level. The principal elements of reform--integration of career approaches in the curriculum, reforms in counseling toward vocational concerns, ensuring that all school leavers have marketable skills, or plans for acquiring them--all have hardly been accomplished.

The fact that the Burkshire complex is decidedly better off than the area of the Federal Project may also have made a difference. Though still in Lakewood's eastside ghetto, the houses and streets are not so squalid, the children are less likely to come from welfare families, and the teachers seem less concerned about discipline and in fact the physical safety of their students and themselves. Then, too, times have changed somewhat. Levels of anger and resentment and the resultant rebelliousness have diminished. School staff have more time now to devote to instruction because they need to devote somewhat less to containment. The relative peacefulness of the environment of the State Project now as compared with the Federal Project certainly makes the job easier.

The project leader for the State Project has an office adjoining the director of vocational education in the downtown headquarters of the Lakewood board of education. The director of the Federal Project has an office on the campus of a vocational high school about 7 miles east. This is a graphic illustration of how "plugged-in" each of the projects has been. The rhetoric about community-based efforts, radical departures from the conventional bureaucracy, decentralization, and opening up the schools is all very well on paper; in a city like Lakewood it does not seem a very effective way to get things done.

What about continuation of the "career idea" at the Madison complex where the Federal Project first introduced it to Lakewood? This is probably the bleakest part of the experience. From what we could learn, virtually nothing but a few library materials at the high school remain to mark the fact that career education passed through. Perhaps there is some lingering awareness on the part of teachers and counselors that not all students are college-bound, that the vast majority will end up in jobs, and that currently the world of work is more unknown to many than the face of the moon. Very few could demonstrate that this awareness influenced the content and style of their interaction with students, however. Typical, if dramatically apposite, were the remarks of the teacher brought into the junior high to conduct the work experience class, which was the only place in that school's curriculum where career development concepts were once attempted. When asked whether he uses these approaches in the social studies course he now teaches, and which is a perfectly appropriate setting for career education, he replied, "Never." When asked why, he argued that it made little sense to the students, that it bored them, that it did not seem to fit into his standard lesson plans, that there just wasn't time! These were the answers from the only teacher who got in-service training at the school. His successor, as the work experience teacher admitted, made some attempt to discuss consumer problems but not much else.

On the other hand, work experience classes were introduced at the junior high by means of the Federal Project and are now permanently installed there. If one believes that such classes are beneficial for 14- and 15-year-old youth, the project should get partial credit for the innovation.

On dissemination to other districts, there was not much to report. Some visitors and inquiries were received and were handled in a routine fashion. Most of the information flow seemed to go in the other direction, however. In the north of the state there is a council on career education that includes representatives from a number of smaller and suburban school systems, many of them considerably more advanced in the planning and conduct of career education projects. The Lakewood people seem to have benefited from advice from these neighboring educators in a significant, if limited, way.

As to dissemination within the Lakewood system, the only systematic effort, aside from the organization of the State Project in the Burkshire cluster, appears to be an attempt to widen access to the central libraries of career materials. We did not feel that either the ex-director of the Federal Project or the current director of the State Project has been assigned to play a missionary role for career education in the Lakewood schools. And, given the rather cool reaction to the concept by the superintendent and the perfunctory expression of approval by his associate for vocational education, it is unlikely that any major effort in this direction will be launched.

CONCLUSIONS

In some important ways, the Commissioner's project in Lakewood is not a test of the efficacy of any particular approach to the fostering of innovation in the local schools. The political pressure to fund projects from Model Cities areas meant that LEA officialdom felt little identity with or responsibility for the project. Backup and expressions of concern have been scant; this may have something to do with the lackluster performance and the absence of effect noticeable in Lakewood. The state-funded project is felt to be central rather than peripheral and is the better thereby.

The late start due to funding delays and tardiness in the arrival of materials meant that the Federal Project did not receive a fair test in the secondary schools where it had only one year's run. Two years of operation in the elementary schools produced a somewhat better outcome but also biased the project design so that much of what the secondary teachers were told in the preparation sessions seemed to them to be irrelevant. No attempt appears to have been made to think through the implications of career education for secondary-level teaching.

The fact that the innovation was attempted in the most disadvantaged schools in the city also must have mitigated against its success. Partial proof of this is the relative ease of installation at the neighboring but less disadvantaged cluster of schools where the state-funded project operates.

It appears as though much of the money for the Federal Project went into hiring large numbers of local aides, specialists, and advisers recommended by the Model Cities Agency. It is difficult to perceive much of a contribution from them. The state-funded project is serving more students at about one-third the yearly cost and using about the same spectrum and scale of techniques.

The district had no appreciable history in experimentation with career education before the funding of the project. In fact, the idea seems hardly to have occurred to them. The guidance available from federal and state officials was meager, to put the best light on it. Little wonder, then, that the school staff spent considerable time trying to decide what to do, waiting for prepackaged materials that never arrived, deploying an excessive and inexperienced staff, and generally spinning wheels. Section III above makes some recommendations concerning possible remedies for this kind of situation.

NORTHSHORE

Anthony H. Pascal

INTRODUCTION

Northshore* is a big city district with 13 high schools, 10 junior highs and middle schools, and 45 elementary schools. Yet in many respects it is perhaps less bureaucratically inert than the largest districts in the West where it is situated or than similar size districts in the Midwest and East. The population is predominantly working class with significant fractions of blacks and orientals in some sections. Recognized ethnic groups also include Scandinavians, American Indians, Polynesians, Mexicans, and Filipinos. European stock population still forms the majority in the city and in the schools.

About four years ago the school district decentralized itself, mainly, we surmised, as a response to the pressures of racial politics. Since then, the decentralization push seems to have faltered and the central administration appears to have regained some lost ground.

The percentage of graduates who go on to post-secondary institutions varies drastically across the high schools. In some it is under 30 percent, in one it is 80 percent and reflects, in general, the socioeconomic status of the neighborhoods served.

One of the most recent and widely touted innovations has been the development of the middle schools to replace junior highs. These came into prominence about the same time a very controversial desegregation plan was promulgated and the middle school movement became associated in many minds with the unpopular bussing proposals.

Vocational education has not, until recently, been a central emphasis of the Northshore LEA. All of the high schools are comprehensive, with a typical sprinkling of shop, business, and home economics courses. Vocationally oriented students could affiliate with a work experience program or could spend part-day at one of the local community colleges, but no very profound occupational training has been available to them on their own high school campuses.

---

*In many respects, the Northshore experience was similar to that of Lakewood. They are both large cities. Both had federal projects that were funded out of the Model Cities set aside. In both, the state career education project paralleled the federally administered project. Thus it seemed preferable to concentrate on local education agencies (LEAs) exhibiting more variation, such as Tip County, Coaltown, Midville, Bikson County, and Eastplace.

Yet, there are (or were) two separate career education projects in the Northshore city schools, both financed out of Vocational Education Amendments, Part D funds. The Commissioner's project (i.e., the Federal Project) took place in Northshore's Model Cities neighborhood in the Arthur High School attendance area. The State Project serves the rest of the system. The latter, as we shall see, was developed precisely to overcome the difficulties noted with respect to occupational programs in secondary schools. The former was established to provide vocational training to students from a very disadvantaged setting. Unlike the case in Lakewood, they have run independent courses and will therefore be described separately under each heading to show the contrasts between the two efforts.

INITIATION: ARTHUR (FEDERALLY ADMINISTERED)

This project, funded out of the Model Cities set aside, was developed and run almost in isolation. Not only did it have only the most peripheral contact with the state education agency (SEA), but it functioned virtually independently of the public school system. In fact, although it began during the period when the predominantly black schools of Central Northshore were probably at the peak of their decentralization-based autonomy, it is not clear whether the Central district administrators had much say in its execution. Again, the project was a creature of the Model Cities Agency, and a strong project director was brought in from outside the schools. He was a retired policeman who had worked in the neighborhood.

The proposal was written by people from the Arthur consortium (the name given in Northshore to a high school and its cluster of feeders) with the help of the Model Cities people. No assistance was requested from SEA or LEA headquarters, and none was received. The central objective seemed clear from the beginning, even though it was a substantial departure from the career education guidelines promulgated by USOE. It was to build a vocational school campus for the Arthur consortium, to outfit and equip the classrooms and shops, and to hire a teaching staff in which community people, rather than conventional educators, predominated. This was accomplished at what is called Arthur B. Some Model Cities funds and some state vocational education subsidies were also used to round out the program at Arthur B.

As far as the proposal went, the Arthur project paralleled other federally administered career education projects. That is, there were distinct approaches to be applied in elementary, middle, and high schools. Stress was to be placed on curriculum revision, field trips, speakers, projects and materials collections.

Counseling was to be made more career relevant. And, of course, career awareness, orientation, and exploration—not vocational training—were to be the watchwords. Part-time career education specialists and $3000 packages of materials were allocated to each of the two middle schools feeding Arthur and to the four elementary schools feeding them. They seem to have produced only the faintest effect in these places. Where most of the money seems to have gone is into the purchase of equipment and supplies and the hiring of teachers for the new vocational school at Arthur B.

The project director was frank to admit the purposefulness of these actions. He felt that curriculum revision would not occur unless teachers could be convinced of some ultimate value to students in a careers approach; there was neither time nor resources available to demonstrate any such outcomes. Field trips and resource speakers never helped anyone earn a living. Counselors don't impart skills, merely advice. Instead, he hired a flock of specialists to teach cosmetology, dry cleaning, auto repair, food preparation, etc. A difficulty was that neither the teachers nor the course contents met the state vocational education standards. State-mandated course advisory committees were not appointed. Consequently, the programs at Arthur B do not lead students toward licenses and certificates that will permit them to practice the trade they have presumably learned. In fact, many enrollees in such courses as auto repair, dry cleaning, and cosmetology were more likely to have malfunctioning cars, soiled clothes, and unstyled hair than any overwhelming desire to learn an occupational skill.

An even more depressing fact about Arthur B is that the handsomely equipped classrooms are almost all empty. During the days of the project, a certain core of standard high school courses was taught at the B campus which brought in students, many of whom became interested in occupational courses. Now all of the nonvocational courses have been pulled back to the A campus so that fewer than 250 students utilize a building designed for almost a thousand. A liberal transfer-out and free transportation plan has cut into Arthur's overall attendance. Exacerbating this is that the black students with the most leadership potential are the most likely to transfer to high schools that are not so disadvantaged.

(The project director cynically predicted that Arthur B would "officially" become Northshore's first vocational high school. In reality it would become a dumping ground for black students with disciplinary problems who would be assigned to it "for their own good" by sanctimonious racist counselors at the predominantly white high schools.)

The only opposition to the Arthur plan was by headquarters administration officials who were upset because regular administrative channels were bypassed or who resented the temporary disintegration of their empires. Yet more than a few acknowledged that the Arthur project did provide a sense of community identity and purposefulness to the people of the neighborhood it served.

The most useful way to interpret what happened in the Arthur project is probably to think of it as rank opportunism following on a rather casual identification of community needs for more high school level job training. This interpretation, admittedly, takes a charitable view of the motivations of the program promoters. Another view might argue that the twenty or more jobs created by the project had a multiplier effect on the economy of the Model Cities area and therefore, in a very roundabout way, helped the students (assuming of course that the new hires lived and spent money in the Model Cities neighborhood).

INITIATION: STATE PROJECT

The State Project was and is much closer to the guidelines for career education projects. It developed from a feeling that occupational education was obviously inadequately provided to Northshore high school students, partly because of disinterest on the part of students and parents. A program of occupational awareness and orientation in the pre-high school years was seen as a means to help build up demand for an educational service which the students needed, whether or not they were aware of the need. Without such a program, the process of dropping out--both literally and psychologically--would continue to plague the schools.

In 1970 a department of occupational education was established as part of the central administrative structure. One of its chief concerns was to promulgate career education in all levels of the school system; a special unit for this purpose was set up under an ex-industrial arts teacher, assisted by two ex-elementary teachers. Much of the planning for their work went on as early as 1969. They utilize funds from the state portion of VEA, Part D which get channeled to them from the SEA. Local funds supplement the state subsidy, which is restricted to schools with some minimum fraction of disadvantaged students.

The approach used in Northshore's career education office for the State Project was developed in 1969 and 1970 in a cluster of schools in a moderate income white neighborhood where reading scores were dropping precipitously. Local funds were used exclusively. The initial intention was to revise the reading curriculum in the direction of career applications so that it would be more relevant to students. That approach seems not to have persisted, but other elements of what turned out to be a rather perfunctory career education program did get their first testing in this experimental program.

The career education office staff claims to have received no appreciable help from the SEA or federal offices in getting their project together. Materials from outside were useless; attendance at conferences taught them nothing. They think of themselves as pure bootstrap, with a little financial help from outside.

In 1970 the board of education made career education part of the basic curriculum in a policy statement which established the department of occupational education. This action was based on a task force report. Stable funding for career education, on the other hand, has not as yet been achieved.

No formal proposal seems to have been required for the receipt of state VEA funds. A formula-based allocation to Northshore appears to have been the mechanism. The task force report could be construed as a proposal, however. No evaluation requirement has been laid down as a condition.

Northshore has gone further in "mechanizing" career education than any district we visited. Most real effort goes into assembling and distributing packages of career materials to each participating school, and starting rather routine hands-on projects (e. g. , simulating a store or newspaper, building boats or preparing meals) in elementary schools.

In some high schools, the careers conference program, with outside speakers, has made progress; in others this idea has scarcely been considered.

A certain lip service is paid—and some action taken—in scheduling field trips. There have been hardly any reforms of basic curriculum and counseling practices. Career education office staff and principals admit lack of progress in these areas but make little noticeable attempt to do much about the problem. Again, the explanation is the disinclination to take on a very difficult task, at least where subject matter teachers in the secondary schools are concerned. Yet even elementary teachers in the system do not give much evidence of being career education converts. At the most academically prestigious of Northshore's high schools, it is interesting to note, there is a fair interest on the part of teachers in relating presentations to vocational concerns. And this interest is reinforced by student involvement, as evidenced by their heavy elective use of the career center's materials.

In addition to a package of largely locally developed career materials, each participating school gets a six-hour in-service workshop for teachers and the assignment of a part-time aide who manages the career materials center and is supposed to help with trips, speakers and projects. The aides appear extremely dissimilar in ability and motivation; they even differ widely with respect to their conceptions of the meaning and purpose of career education.

Northshore is probably best characterized as working on the basis of an R&D model. They felt a need and developed a program which seemed to them to promise results. They then used local and state funds to flesh it out. What happened along the road, however, was that the treatment became perfunctory, superficial, and routinized. Whether the flaw lay in the concept or the execution is the important question.

IMPLEMENTATION: ARTHUR

Arthur, as most of the federally administered projects, started late. Yet, since building a vocational campus was the central aim, it seems not to have been severely crimped by its failure to receive funds before early 1971. If an attempt had been made to orient and prepare subject matter teachers, to bring the world of work into the classroom, and to turn the high school counselors around, the Federal Project would have suffered from the delay. Curriculum coordinators were assigned to the middle and elementary schools, but no one seems to remember what it was, exactly, that they did.

It is hard to think of any particularly strong points about the Arthur project unless one is impressed by the mere existence of physical facilities. Unfortunately, these handsome facilities are not even used. At least part of the blame for the flight of students from the Arthur B campus must be attributed to the low quality of occupational courses offered there. If students were really being outfitted with salable occupational skills, one would expect that a good number of them would have continued to make the four-block hike from Arthur A, even after the nonvocational courses had been pulled back to that campus.

The real weak points, however, were the abdication of responsibilities on the part of LEA and federal officials. They seem to have written off this effort even more blatantly than in other Model Cities projects. Monitoring and evaluation appear to have been virtually nonexistent, although an evaluation was conducted and a report was filed, as per regulation. Perhaps the project staff would have brooked no interference, but there is no evidence that anyone tested this.

IMPLEMENTATION: STATE PROJECT

Aides and materials packages are dispatched to any school which demonstrates that 80 percent of its teachers are "committed" to career education. This does not seem to be a very stringent requirement since all Northshore schools (except those in the Arthur cluster) have come in or are on the waiting list. The career education office staff, in fact, complain that they now have insufficient time to prepare school faculties and administrations properly. Time for workshops has been compressed. And each circuit rider must now cover more territory.

We found that problems of implementation were different in each school. Teacher resistance does not crop up as an obstacle as frequently as in other cities, mostly because no really serious attempt to enlist teachers for curriculum change so far appears to have been made. Rather, the complaints center around the quality and location of space made available for the career materials center and the indifference of teachers and counselors about using the materials or assigning their use to students.

In some high schools, work/experience teachers were closely tied into the careers material centers and have even offered mini-courses on occupational decisionmaking, job search strategies, or the like for the general student body. In other schools the work/experience component program goes its own way. There did appear to be some indication that because of the exigencies of local funding the career centers had an unstable life. Some were actually dismantled and then reopened. Others had erratic operating hours. Centers occasionally would be aide-less.

ADAPTATION: ARTHUR

The Arthur project changed little over its course. Organization and content remained fairly constant, although some evidence shows that those components that the project staff never took seriously—curriculum revision, improvements in counseling practices—got even less attention as time went on.

We were not able to determine whether community support levels changed over time. This is not suprising because there was little evidence of community involvement to begin with.

Evaluation, as we mentioned, was perfunctory and correspondingly ineffectual.

ADAPTATION: STATE PROJECT

The major change in the State Project over time is that it has become increasingly routinized and increasingly physical (as opposed to intellectual), in its manifestation. There is no indication that general teaching practices have shifted in any dramatic way, nor does it appear that cases of unusually effective classroom approaches have been disseminated to other participating teachers.

One example of the impact of the State Project on the Northshore system was pointed out to us. It was suggested that the difficulties of integrating career-relevant material into the curriculum highlighted the very individualistic and uncoordinated nature of the curriculum in Northshore. The need for central direction and guidance in many curriculum matters, it was suggested, emerged from the difficulties encountered by the career education staff. That this is actually recognized as a district problem seems to us open to question; the persons who claimed the new awareness was as a result of the career education project also claimed to have reformed the modus operandi of school guidance counselors by supplying them with guidance materials. The reality of this second claim was certainly not established during our site interviews and observations.

CONTINUATION/DISSEMINATION: ARTHUR

There has been neither. The State Project in Northshore antedated the Arthur project. Even the vocational school that was built with aid from the federal grant may pass out of existence or at least out of the control of the Northshore board of education. (The future of Arthur B is very uncertain; it may become a vocational high school--or, according to skeptics, a holding tank for black disciplinary problems--or it may be combined with an adult manpower training center, or it may be dismantled.)

CONTINUATION/DISSEMINATION: STATE PROJECT

The State Project is continuing. Receipt of state funds by Northshore is semi-automatic. Publicity for a recent successful school levy explicitly included the need for occupational education as one of the reasons for raising taxes. On the other hand, there is a serious possibility that the overall school budget will be cut by as much as 8 percent for the 1974-75 school year. All queried feared that a cut would fall disproportionately on career education. If that program were not considered a frill, would such worries be entertained?

There is not much to cut back, really. Most schools already have their materials packages safely (and sometimes obscurely) tucked away into their libraries. The coordinators have not been impressively successful in getting teachers and counselors to change their ways. Would a cessation of missionary activities by coordinators cause many converts to backslide? Doubtful. Northshore appears to have already gone a good distance with a relatively cheap, low profile program.

CONCLUSIONS

Northshore has two major lessons to present:

1. There is no predicting what will result from a program no one much cares about controlling. The history of the Arthur effort illustrates the waywardness of such undertakings. The alliance of Model Cities activists and school building personnel could not succeed in shifting the direction of vocational education planning. Such decisions are made at board of education headquarters. The central administration never felt that the Arthur project was theirs, and therefore they were purposefully blind to its defects and never expected to learn from its history. Nor, it seems, did they.

   The Arthur project was also unfortunate in its timing. Even if it had been brilliantly conceived and effectively executed, and relevant to demonstrated needs, its beginning in the midst of the desegregation/bussing/decentralization controversy would have militated against success. It suffered something of the fate of the middle school movement which emerged at about the same time.

2. There is no great difficulty in installing and conducting a superficial, program. The State Project shows it can be done if the concentration is on physical aspects and if no strenuous attempt is made to confront powerful interests or venerable operating modes.

   The State Project did appear to receive strong rhetorical backing from the superintendent down to the classroom teacher. This was not sufficient, however, because all participants seem to have been willing to settle for a weak and mechanical treatment, which has done little to change anything important.